

A GRAMMAR  
OF THE  
CLASSICAL ARABIC LANGUAGE,

TRANSLATED AND COMPILED FROM THE WORKS

OF THE

MOST APPROVED NATIVE OR NATURALIZED AUTHORITIES.

---

By MORTIMER SLOPER HOWELL, C.I.E.,

H. M.'s BENGAL CIVIL SERVICE,

*Member of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, and Fellow of the University of Calcutta, and of  
the Anyuman-i-Panyab.*

---

PUBLISHED

UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF THE GOVERNMENT, N.-W. PROVINCES.

---

IN AN INTRODUCTION AND FOUR PARTS.

The Introduction : and Part I.—The Noun.



---

ALLAHABAD :

PRINTED AT THE NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES AND OUDH GOVERNMENT PRESS,

1886.





## CORRECTIONS.

---

*P.* 131 A, *l.* 17. For "AF" throughout this Note read "LM".

*P.* 132 A, *ll.* 2-3. Read "on Monday the 12th of Rabi' alAwwal "

—*l.* 4. Read "and 12 days".

## NOTICE.

---

PAGES XXV-XXVI of the Contents and 87A-88A of the Notes are to be substituted for the corresponding pages given in the 1st Fasciculus of Part I.

M. S. HOWELL.

*The 14th July, 1886.*

## ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

P. xxv, l. 23. Read "*cop.*"

P. xxvii, l. 2. Read "*met.*"

P. xxviii, l. l. Read "explanation"—*ibid.* Read <sup>أفعل</sup>.

P. xxix, l. 21. Read "latent"—l. 29. Read "*pron.*"—l. 31. Read "*gen.*"—l. l. Read "*pron.*"

P. xxxi, l. 19. Read "in the"—*ibid.* Read "574".

P. xli, l. 16. Read <sup>ويب</sup>.

P. xlii, l. 22. Read <sup>ويث</sup>.

P. li, l. 1. Read "form of the *sing.*"

P. 638, l. 2. R here enters upon the discussion of the methods allowable in interrogation with <sup>من</sup> about a mentioned rational *det.*, in which case the ordinary method is to repeat the *det.*, putting it in the *nom.* after <sup>من</sup>; so that, when a man says <sup>أيت زيد</sup> or <sup>أخا زيد</sup>, you say <sup>من زيد</sup> or <sup>أخو زيد</sup> *Who is Zaid or the brother of Zaid?*

P. 698, l. 12. Before "proper" insert "[generic]"—ll. 14 and 17. For "[proper]" read "[personal proper]".

P. 709, l. 16. "their likes" are *preps.*

P. 760, l. 18. For "(i.e." read "[i.e."

P. 93A, l. 20 and l. 29. Read "l. l."

P. 94A, l. 10. Read "l. l."

P. 95A, l. 19. Read "if her".

P. 96A, ll. 2-3. Read "AlYaman" and "dependent"—l. 19. Read <sup>رأيت</sup> and <sup>للتيا</sup>.

P. 98A, l. l. Read "transmits".

P. 104A, l. l. Read "and inceptive [423], an answer".

P. 114A, l. 17. Read "context"—l. l. Read "not an".

P. 115A, l. 1. Read "*pron.* as".

P. 117A, l. 13. Read "His"—ll. 13-14. Put "His name . . . my knowledge" within marks of quotation.

P. 130A, l. l. Put a comma after "him".

P. 131A, l. 1. Read "One of".

P. 132A, l. 25. Read "AlMaṣṣūr".

## Additions and Corrections to the Abbreviations of References.

---

AKB. The *Khizānat alAdab wa Lubb Lubāb Lisān al'Arab* (c. 1073—1079), an Exposition of the evidentiary verses cited in the Commentary of R upon the IH, by the Shaikh 'ABD ALKĀDIR Ibn 'Umar ALBAGHDĀDĪ, resident of Cairo, the Philologist (b. 1030, d. 1093), printed at Būlāk in 1292.

\* Amr. The Gloss (c. 1188) of the Shaikh Muḥammad ALAMĪR alAzhari upon the ML, printed in Egypt in 1299.

\* CD. The Commentary of Khfj upon the D, cited from extracts given in Thorbecke's Notes on the D, and latterly from the edition printed at Constantinople in 1300.

\* D. The *Durrat alGhawwās* by H, edited by Thorbecke, and printed at Constantinople with the Commentary of Khfj.

\* EC. The Commentary of the SAYYID MUḤAMMAD Ibn 'Alī Ibn ALḤusain alMūsawī al'Āmilī alJubā'i, the Philologist (b. 946, d. 1009), upon the evidentiary verses of the C, cited from an incomplete MS.

[The Author is so named in the LB, p. 42, and in the preface to the EC. The *Amal alĀmil*, as noticed in the LB, wrongly attributes the work to the Sayyid Ḥusain (d. 1069), son of the Sayyid Muḥammad.]

\* FA. The *Fawā'id alKalā'id fī Mukhtaṣar Sharḥ ashShawāhid*, commonly called *AshShawāhid aṣṢughrā*, an abridgment of the MN, by its Author, cited from a MS.

[The HKh. IV. 393 calls it the *Farā'id alFarw'id*.]

\* Khfj. The *Raiḥānat alAlibbā wa Zahrat alHayāt adDunyā*, a Biographical Dictionary of Contemporary Celebrities, by Maulānā the Kāḍī Shihāb adDīn Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad ALKHAḤĀJĪ alMiṣrī alḤanafī, the Philologist (d. 1069), printed in Egypt in 1294.

\* Khls. The *Khulāṣat alAthar fī A'yān alKarn alḤādī-'Ashar*, a Biographical Dictionary of the Celebrities of the 11th Century, by the Maulā MUḤAMMAD AMĪN Ibn Faḍl Allāh ALMUḤIBBĪ, great-grandson of MDE, alḤamawī by origin, adDimashkī by birth and abode, alḤanafī, the Historian and Philologist (b. 1061, d. 1111), printed in Egypt in 1284.

\* LB. The *Lu'lu'at al-Bahrain ji-Ijāz al-Kurratay-l'Aln* (c. 1182), a Series of Biographies of the Learned Men of Al-Bahrain, by the Shaikh Yūsuf Ibn Ahmad Ibn Ibrāhīm ad-Darāzi al-Baḥranī, the Philologist (b. 1107), lithographed at Bombay.

MDE. The Ḳāḍī Muhibb ad-Dīn Abū l-Faḍl Muḥammad Ibn Taḳī ad-Dīn Abī Bakr al-'Uṭwānī al-Ḥanawī by birth and education, ad-Dī-mashḳī al-Ḥanafī, known as MUḤIBB ABDŪN EFFENDĪ, the Philologist (b. 949, d. 1016), great-grandfather of the Author of the Khls.

\* MN. The Commentary named *Al-Maḳāṣid an-Naḥwīya fī Sharḥ Shawāhid Shurūḥ al-Alfiya*, commonly called *Ash-Shawāhid al-Kubrā* (c. 806), by the Ḳāḍī Badr ad-Dīn Abū Muḥammad Maḥmūd Ibn Ahmad as-Sarūjī al-Ḥanafī, known as AL-'AINĪ, born at 'Ain Tāb, the Jurist and Grammarian (b. 762, d. 855), upon the evidentiary verses cited in the Commentaries of BD, IUK, IA, and IHsh upon the IM, printed upon the margin of the AKB.

\* N. The Commentary named *Tanzīl al-Āyāt 'ala-sh-Shawāhid min al-Abyāt*, by MDE, upon the evidentiary verses of the K, edited by Abū-l-Wafā Naṣr al-Ḥurīnī, and printed at Bulāḳ in 1281.

\* NA. The *Nuzhat al-Alibbā fī Ṭabaḳāt al-Uḍabā*, a Treatise on the Classes of the Philologists, by KIamb, printed in Egypt in 1291.

\* SD. The *Silk ad-Durar fī A'yān al-Kam ath-Thānī-'Ashar*, a Biographical Dictionary of the Celebrities of the 12th Century, by the Sayyid Ṣadr ad-Dīn Abū-l-Faḍl MUḤAMMAD KHALĪL EFFENDĪ Ibn 'Alī Effendī al-Murādī al-Bukhārī ad-Dimashḳī an-Naḳshbandī, the Historian and Philologist, printed at Bulāḳ in 1301 from a MS written at Damascus in 1211.

## Page.

- agreement of the *pre.* and *post. ns.* in number and gender is a condition of such government ... 451—465
- § 150. The *subst.*—definition given by IH—the *subst.* after  $\bar{y}$  how included in this definition—definition given by IM and IHsh—classification—best construction in the case of the *subst.* of blunder—the *subst.* of pure blunder or of forgetfulness not allowable in poetry ... 465—468
- § 151. The *ant.* is subsidiary to the mention of the *subst.*—but is not meant to be rejected—refutation of the theory that it is virtually rejected as regards the sense—and as regards the letter ... 468—469
- § 152. The *op.* of the *ant.* is virtually repeated with the *subst.* ... 469
- § 153. The *subst.* and *ant.* need not agree in determinateness and indeterminateness—but may be both *det.*, both *indet.*, or one *det.* and the other *indet.*—the *indet. subst.* for a *det.* ought to be qualified—application of this rule ... 469—471
- § 154. The *subst.* and *ant.* are both explicit *ns.*, both *prons.*, or one an explicit *n.* and the other a *pron.*—the partial *subst.* and the *subst.* of implication need a pronominal *cof.*—omission of the *cop.*—theory that the  $\int$  may supply the place of the *pron.*—or that the suppression of the *pron.* may be explained by holding the *subst.* to be treated as a *corrob.*—the total *subst.* does not need a *cop.*—the *interrog.* Hamza prefixed to the *subst.* for an *interrog. n*—the *v.* a *subst.* for the *v.*—anacoluthon—order of the *subst.* and other *appos.*—suppression of the *ant.* ... 471—478
- § 155. Syndesis—the *synd. expl.*—the other *appos.* how excluded by this definition—the *synd. expl.* must be *prim.*—its concord with the *ant.*—dispute as to whether the *synd. expl.* and its *ant.* may be *indets.*—the *synd. expl.*, being like the *ep.*, must contain the generic  $\int$  when its *ant.* is a *dem.*

	—but is allowed by S to be anarthrous when the <i>dem.</i> is a <i>voc.</i> —and by S and Zd to consist of 2 <i>sings.</i> coupled together when the <i>dem.</i> is a <i>du.</i> —the latter construction disallowed by S, Zd, and others in the <i>cp.</i> —but allowed by S when the <i>du.</i> is a <i>voc.</i> ... ..	478—481
§ 156.	The <i>synd. expl.</i> how distinguishable from the <i>subst.</i> —either allowable—the <i>synd. expl.</i> necessary—the <i>subst.</i> necessary—differences between them—R's theory of their identity—explanation of their alleged differences— <i>acc.</i> where either is admissible—suppression of the <i>ant.</i> ...	481—491
§ 157.	Definition of the coupled—defence of the definition—the coupled is separated from its <i>ant.</i> by a <i>con.</i> —the <i>cp.</i> is sometimes coupled to an <i>cp.</i> ..	491—493
§ 158.	Coupling to the attached <i>nom. pron.</i> —to the detached <i>nom. pron.</i> , and attached or detached <i>acc. pron.</i> —to the <i>gen. pron.</i> —discussion as to whether the <i>gen.</i> is coupled to the <i>gen.</i> , or the <i>op.</i> and <i>gen.</i> to the <i>op.</i> and <i>gen.</i> —and whether the coupled is governed in the <i>gen.</i> by the first <i>op.</i> or the second—repetition of the genitival <i>op.</i> not necessary in a case of necessity—nor, according to some, in a case of choice ...	492—498

#### CHAPTER V.—THE UNINFLECTED NOUN.

§ 159.	Definition of uninflectedness—definitions of the <i>uninfl. n.</i> —its predicament—it is permanent or accidental—the cause of its uninflectedness according to Z—and according to IM—when the <i>pre. n.</i> gains uninflectedness from the <i>uninfl. post.</i> —allowable uninflectedness of the vague <i>n.</i> of time <i>pre.</i> to a <i>prop.</i> —permanent uninflectedness of <i>ns.</i> necessarily <i>pre.</i> to a <i>prop.</i> —terminations of the <i>uninfl. n.</i> —names of the terminations—distribution of the terminations—classification of the <i>uninfl. ns.</i> ... ..	499—505
--------	---	---------

## THE PRONOUNS.

- § 160. The *pron.* is called *emt.* by the KK—its definition—its exponent—positions where it relates to an expression posterior literally and in natural order—choice of exponent when determined by proximity—the explicit *n.* substituted for the *pron.*—the *pron.* is (1) attached, (a) prominent or (b) latent, (2) detached ... 506—511
- § 161. The *pron.* is *uninfl.*—its terminations—reason of its uninflectedness—some *prons.* are common to 2 or more cases—there are *prons.* for all 3 cases—which are attached, and which detached—assortment of the *prons.* with reference to case and attachment or detachment—meanings of each sort—expressions constituted for the attached *nom. prons.* of each *pers.*—and for the remaining sorts of *prons.* of each *pers.*—aggregate of words and meanings—the ت—its variations—the ت in the variations of أَيُّكَ<sup>٨٤٦</sup> attached *nom. pron.* of the 3rd *pers.*—the ت in ضَرَبْتَ<sup>٨٤٧</sup> and ضَرَبْنَا<sup>٨٤٨</sup> a *p.*, not a *pron.*—the ا, ي, and ن—the ا, sometimes used for irrational objects—the ا, ي, and ن seldom *ps.*—the ي—attached *nom. pron.* in the *aor.*, *imp.*, and *prohib.*—in the *eps.*, i. e. *act.* and *pass. parts.* and assimilate *ep.*, and in the verbal *ns.* and *advs.*—detached *nom. pron.*—أَنَا<sup>٨٤٩</sup>—فَنَحْنُ<sup>٨٥٠</sup>—هُوَ<sup>٨٥١</sup> and هِيَ<sup>٨٥٢</sup>—their, and اَنْتَ<sup>٨٥٣</sup>—vocalized, elided, made quiescent, or doubled—*du.* and *pl.* of the detached *nom. pron.* of the 3rd *pers.*—the detached *nom. prons.* are common to the *pret.*, *aor.*, *imp.*, and *eps.*—expressions constituted for the attached *acc.* and *gen. prons.* of each *pers.*—vowel of the *α* in the *sing. masc.*—impletion, slurring, or elision of this vowel after a mobile—slurring or impletion of the vowel



after a quiescent—summary of the <i>dial. vars.</i> in the <i>ʔ</i> of the <i>sing. masc.</i> after a Kasra or quiescent <i>ى</i> —implotion, slurring, or elision of the vowel of the <i>ʔ</i> in the <i>sing. masc.</i> when a soft letter is elided before the <i>ʔ</i> —vowel of the <i>ʔ</i> in the <i>du.</i> and <i>pl.</i> —quiescence or vocalization of the <i>م</i> of the <i>pl.</i> after the <i>ʔ</i> pronounced with Kasr, and implotion of its vowel when it is followed by a mobile—summary of the states of the <i>م</i> after the <i>ʔ</i> pronounced with Kasr—states of the <i>م</i> after the <i>ʔ</i> pronounced with Damm—detached <i>acc. pron.</i> —its constitution— <i>gen. pron.</i> —it must be attached, and is exactly like the attached <i>acc.</i> —the <i>ى</i> , <i>ك</i> , and <i>ʔ</i> when <i>obj.</i> and when <i>post.</i> —the <i>ك</i> in <i>زيدك</i> <sup>زيدك</sup> <i>زيدك</i> when a <i>p.</i> and when a <i>post. n.</i> — <i>pl.</i> of magnification— <i>pl. masc.</i> for <i>sing. masc.</i> or <i>sing. fem.</i> — <i>sing.</i> for <i>pl.</i> —the <i>pron.</i> treated like the <i>dem.</i> ... ..	511—532
§ 162. <i>اِيَّايَ</i> and its variations ... ..	532—533
§ 163. Detachment of <i>nom.</i> or <i>acc. pron.</i> not allowable except when attachment is impossible—rules for attachment and detachment when <i>nom.</i> or <i>acc. pron.</i> is governed (1) by a <i>v.</i> —(2) by something else ... ..	533—539
§ 164. Rules for attachment and detachment when 2 <i>prons.</i> follow an <i>op.</i> , (1) when the <i>op.</i> is a <i>v.</i> , (a) if the 2nd <i>pron.</i> be an <i>appos.</i> —(b) if the 2nd <i>pron.</i> be not an <i>appos.</i> —(2) when the <i>op.</i> is a <i>n.</i> —attachment or detachment of pronominal <i>pred.</i> of <i>كُن</i> , etc. ... ..	540—544
§ 165. No <i>pron.</i> latent except attached <i>nom.</i> —cause of its latency—attached <i>nom. pron.</i> when not apparent— <i>ag.</i> , explicit or pronominal, when not apparent— <i>xplanation</i> of instance where <i>ag.</i> of <i>أَفْعَلْ</i>	

- seems to be apparent as a detached *pron.*—*ag.* when apparent as an explicit *n.* or detached *pron.*—explanation of instances where *ag.* of <sup>أَفْعَل</sup> seems to be apparent as an explicit *n.*, and *ag.* of <sup>نَفْعَل</sup> as a detached *pron.* of the 2nd pers. or as an explicit *n.* ... 544—546
166. Form of detached *nom. pron.* intervenes between *inch.* and *enunc.* before and after prefixion of their *lit. ops.*—is named distinctive by the BB, and support by the KK—the <sup>ا</sup> of inception is prefixed to it—the *inch.* ought to be *det.*, and the *enunc.* synarthrous—the distinctive remains fixed in case, but varies in number, gender, and pers.—is introduced where the *enunc.* is anarthrous, but an <sup>أَفْعَل</sup> of superiority—conditions of the *pron.* named distinctive and support—its import—some Arabs make it an *inch.*, and what follows it its *enunc.* ... 546—551
- § 167. The *pron.* of the *case* or *fact*—named *pron.* of the *unknown* by the KK—is (1) attached, (a) prominent or (b) latest, (2) detached—when *fem.*—may not be suppressed, except when an *acc.*—*exs.* of its suppression when *sub.* of <sup>أَنَّ</sup>—its irregularities—the *expos. prop.* after it must have both its terms expressed—must be nominal, except when an annuller of inchoation is prefixed to the *pron.*—and must be enunciatory, except when *pred.* of the contracted <sup>أَنَّ</sup> ... 551—554
- §. 168. The *prop.* in <sup>رَبِّهِ رَجُلًا</sup> and <sup>نَعْمَ رَجُلًا</sup> ... 554
- § 169. The *pron.* after <sup>لَوْلَا</sup> and <sup>عَسَى</sup>—analysis of <sup>لَوْلَا</sup> followed by a *gc.n pron.*—and of <sup>عَسَى</sup> followed by an *acc. prop.* ... 555—557

- § 170. The *ن* of *protection* or *support*—why introduced into the *v.*—inseparable from all paradigms of the *v.* except the 5 paradigms of the *eor.* containing the *ن* of inflection—may be elided with the *ن* of inflection, but not with the *ن* of the *pron.*, nor with the single or double *ن* of corroboration—dispute whether the elided be the *ن* of protection or the *ن* of inflection—the *ن* of the *pron.*, or the single or double *ن* of corroboration not elided with the *ن* of protection—the *ن* of protection elided with the *ن* of the *pron.* by poetic license—methods allowable with the *ن* of inflection—expression or omission of the *ن* of protection with *لَيْسَ* and *عَسَى*—with the *أَعْلَمُ* of wonder—with verbal *ns.*—with *لَعَلَّ*—with *كَانَ* and *لَكِنَّ*, *أَنَّ*, *وَأَنَّ*—with *قَدْ*, *عَنْ*, *مِنْ*—*لَيْتَ*—*بَجَلْ*—*لَدُنْ* ... 557—562
- § 170A. Degrees of particularity in the *prons.*—the more particular prevails over the less ... 562

---

THE DEMONSTRATIVES.

- § 171. Definitions—the *dems.* contain the sense of *vs.*—demonstrate *orig.* only sensible and visible objects—their numbers, genders, and cases—the *sing. masc.* used for the *sing. fem.* or *du. fem.*—similar usage in the *pron.*—the *dems.* are *uninfl.*—their terminations—reason of their uninflectedness—dispute on the uninflectedness of the *du.*—similar dispute on the *du.* of the conjunct—*ذَانِ*, *الَّذَانِ*, and the like are *quasi-*

- du. ns.*, not real *das*.—ذَانِ , تَانِ , اَلَّذَانِ , and اَلَّتَانِ occur in all 3 cases—the *dems.* are vague, and must therefore be explained by an *ep.* when they are likely to confuse ... 563—570
- § 172. The ك of allocution is affixed to them to notify [by its variations] the number and gender of the person addressed—it is a *p.*, not a *pron.*—does not indicate person, but only allocution—varies with the number and gender of the person addressed—aggregate of *dems.* so formed—the ك is invariable in one *dial.*—ذٰلِكَ for ذٰلِكُمْ ... 570—572
- § 173. The ل is inserted before the ك to indicate the *distance* of the demonstrated—distinction in meaning between ذَا , ذَاكَ , and ذٰلِكَ—some make no distinction between ذَاكَ and ذٰلِكَ—numbers and genders of the *dems.* importing *distance*—reduplication of the ن in ذَانِ and ذَانِ— and in ذَانِ and ذَانِ—the ل when omitted—always omitted in the *dial.* of Tamim 572—674
- § 174. The premonitory *p.* هَا is prefixed to the *dems.*—هٰذَا and its variations—هٰذَاكَ and its variations—the هَا is not part of the *dem.*—explanation of هٰذَا as an *acc.* ... 574—576
- § 175. *Dems.* of *place*—هٰهَـنَا and هٰهَـنَا—هٰهَـنَا is always used as an *adv.*—and so هٰهَـنَا—the ك of allocu-

tion is affixed, and the premonitory هَا prefixed, to هُنَا and هَهُنَا, but not to نَمَ — and the ل is inserted—distinction in meaning between هُنَا, هُنَاكَ, and هُنَاكَ — نَمَ and هَهُنَا are like هُنَاكَ in meaning—هُنَاكَ, هُنَاكَ, and هَهُنَا sometimes denote *time*—dispute as to whether they are then *pre.* to the *prop.* ... 576—578

#### THE CONJUNCTS.

- § 176. اَلَّذِي and its variations—the *sing.*—reduplication or elision of the ي in the *sing.*—the ا and ل in all 3 numbers are *red.*—added to impart the form of the *det.*—the *du.*—reduplication of the ن in the *du.*—similar reduplication in the *du.* of the *dems.*—elision of the ن in the *du.*—dispute as to whether the *du.* are *infl.* or *uninfl.*—اَلَّذَانِ and اَلَّتَانِ occur in all 3 cases—the *pl. masc.*—اَلَّذَيْنِ written with one ل—elision of the ن from اَلَّذَيْنِ and اَلَّذَيْنِ—other forms of the *pl. masc.*—the *pl. fem.*—conjuncts common to all genders and numbers—أَلْ—مَا—مَنْ—مَنْ—أَي expressly or constructively *pre.* to a *det.*—sometimes feminized, dualized, and pluralized—the Tā'ī ذُو—its *dial. vars.*—ذَا—the conjuncts, with some exceptions, are *uninfl.*—their terminations—reason of their uninflectedness—the conjunct ought to be *infl.*—the *conj.* has not a place in inflection—nor have the conjunct and its *conj.* together—the conjuncts are vague 579—590

§ 177. Definition of the conjunct—its *conj.*, except the *conj.*

of  $\hat{\text{أ}}$  —the *rel.*—the *conj.* is a verbal, nominal, *cond.*, or adverbial *prop.*—this *prop.* must be enunciatory—and needs a *cop.*—the *pers.* of the

*rel. pron.*—the *conj.* of  $\hat{\text{أ}}$  —it is constructively a verbal *prop.* containing a *rel. pron.*—its *o. f.*—it

receives the inflection properly belonging to  $\hat{\text{أ}}$

—anomalous *conjs.* of  $\hat{\text{أ}}$  —they prove  $\hat{\text{أ}}$  not to be a *p.* of determination, but are peculiar to poetry—the *prim.* synarthrous substantive as a conjunct—the *conj.* or part of it does not precede the conjunct—nor does the *conj.* or any thing depending upon it govern what precedes the conjunct—nor does the *conj.* depend upon what precedes the conjunct—nor is the conjunct separated from the *conj.*, or part of the *conj.* from part, by an *appos.* or *enunc.* of, or *exc.* from, the conjunct—in poetry a conjunct occurs coupled to a conjunct before the *conj.*—sometimes a conjunct is separated from its *conj.* by a *reg.* of the *conj.*—such separation is not allowable

with a conjunct *p.*, nor with the conjunct  $\hat{\text{أ}}$  —part of the *conj.* may be separated from part by something coupled to the *conj.*—part of the *conj.* precedes part—suppression of the conjunct

*n.* other than  $\hat{\text{أ}}$  — of the *conj.* of the conjunct

*n.* other than  $\hat{\text{أ}}$  — the *rel.* of  $\hat{\text{أ}}$  may not be suppressed—nor may one of two *rels.* when combined in the *conj.*—suppression of the *rel.* in other cases                   ...                   ...                   ...

590—606

§ 178.  $\hat{\text{أَلَّذِي}}$  is a connective to the qualification of *dets.*

by *props.*—the fact announced by the *conj.* *prop.* ought to be known to the person addressed

- distinction between the *conj.* and the attribute—**الَّذِي** and its *fem.* are lightened by elision of the **ي** alone or with the preceding vowel—the **ن** is elided from its *du.* and *pl.*—its *sing.* is used to indicate the *pl.*—number of the *rel. pron.* in that case ... .. 606—607
- § 179. **الَّذِي** has a wider range in the process of enunciation than **أَلِي**—an *enunc.* is not made to **أَلِي** except from a *n.* in a verbal *prop.*—conditions requisite in the *v.*—enunciation is a process instituted for examination and exercise of the student—when permissible—method of effecting it—concord of the conjunct in number and gender with the *n.* made an *enunc.*—latency or detachment of the *pron.* governed in the *nom.* by the *qual.* occurring as *conj.* of **أَلِي**—conditions of the *n.* that an *enunc.* is made from—enunciation when disallowed ... .. 608—614
- § 180. **مَا**—the **مَا** that follows an *indet.* to import *vagueness* and *corroboration of indeterminateness*—**مَا** denotes mostly the *irrational*, sometimes the *rational*, often the *qualities of the rational*, sometimes the *unknown in quiddity and essence.* 614—619
- § 181. Its **ا** is subject to conversion and elision—conversion of the **ا** — **مَهْمَا** — **مَهْمَا** is simple, not compounded—its meanings—elision of the **ا** with retention or elision of the Fatha—the **ا** is elided in interrogation, but expressed in enunciation—the **ا** is expressed in interrogation in extraordinary readings and poetic licenses, not in ordinary readings—the **ا** is not elided when the *interrog.* **مَا** is compounded with **أَلِي**—**مَا** when written conjoined and when disjoined ... .. 619—627

- § 182.  $\text{مِنْ}^{\text{ا}}$  —  $\text{مِنْ}^{\text{ا}}$  as a complete *indet.* or *red.*—  $\text{مِنْ}^{\text{ا}}$  mostly denotes the *rational*, sometimes the *irrational*—  $\text{مِنْ}^{\text{ا}}$  and  $\text{لَا}^{\text{ا}}$  are literally *sing. masc.*, but are applied to all numbers and genders—observance of the letter is more frequent in expressions made to accord with them than observance of the sense—observance preferable or necessary—precedence of, and reversion to, observance of the letter when the two observances are combined—  $\text{مِنْ}^{\text{ا}}$  when written disjoined, and when conjoined ... 627—633
- § 183. In interrogation with  $\text{مِنْ}^{\text{ا}}$  about a mentioned rational *indet.* 3 methods are allowable in pause upon  $\text{مِنْ}^{\text{ا}}$ , (1) to imitate in  $\text{مِنْ}^{\text{ا}}$  the inflection of the *indet.* and the signs of its number and gender—the letters of prolongation are added in the *sing. masc.*—imitation of the inflection is omitted in the *sing. fem.* and *pl. fem.*—the  $\text{ن}$  before the  $\text{ت}$  is made quiescent in the *du. fem.*, and sometimes in the *sing. fem.*, but is sometimes mobilized in the *du. fem.*—(2) to add the letters of prolongation, imitating only the inflection appropriate to the *sing. masc.*, whatever be the number and gender of the *indet.*—(3) to put  $\text{مِنْ}^{\text{ا}}$  alone in every state without imitation—imitation allowed by Y in continuity—  $\text{مِنْ}^{\text{ا}}$  is *infl.* in some *dials.*—the signs mentioned are affixed only at the end of the sentence—question how put when the rational and irrational are combined—methods allowable in interrogation with  $\text{مِنْ}^{\text{ا}}$  about a mentioned rational *det.*—and about a *rel. ep.* of a proper name ... 634—643



- § 184. <sup>وَع</sup>أَي — <sup>سَع</sup>أَي as a qualified *indet.*— <sup>وَع</sup>أَي when decidedly apothetic— <sup>وَع</sup>أَي is *infl.*, except in vocation—the *interrog.* or *cond.* <sup>سَع</sup>أَي is *infl.* unrestrictedly—the conjunct <sup>وَع</sup>أَي has 1 states—the conjunct <sup>وَع</sup>أَي when *infl.*, and when *uninfl.* upon Damm—conditions of the *op.* of the conjunct <sup>وَع</sup>أَي ... 643—646
- § 185. In interrogation with <sup>سَع</sup>أَي about a mentioned *indet.* 2 methods are allowable, (1) to imitate in <sup>سَع</sup>أَي the inflection of the *indet.* and the signs of its number and gender—reason and pause why required as conditions of imitation with <sup>اَ</sup>مَنْ, and not with <sup>سَع</sup>أَي —(2) to restrict oneself in continuity to inflecting <sup>سَع</sup>أَي in the *sing.*, whatever be the number and gender of the *indet.*—the vowels and other signs affixed to <sup>اَ</sup>مَنْ and <sup>سَع</sup>أَي in the state of imitation are imitative alliterations, these words being in the place of a *nom.* by inchoation—in interrogation with <sup>سَع</sup>أَي about *dets.* what follows it is not imitated—the *n.* is sometimes imitated without a question—imitation is allowable, according to this *dial.*, in *dets.* after <sup>اَ</sup>مَنْ or <sup>سَع</sup>أَي ... 646—648
- § 186. The *dems.* as conjuncts = مَاذَا — ذَا ... 648—651

---

THE VERBAL NOUNS AND EJACULATIONS.

- § 187. Definition of the verbal *n.* given by IH—definition given by IM and Fk—expressions excluded by the latter definition—mood and tense indicated by the verbal *n.*—the verbal *ns.* are *uninfl.*—

their terminations—reason of their uninflectedness—meaning of the term “verbal *ns.*”—object of using them—they are shorter and more intensive than *vs.*—what they indicate—why they are not called *vs.*—their *o. fs.*—they are all transferred from original *inf. ns.*, from *inf. ns. orig. ejs.*, from *advs.*, or from *preps.* and *gens.* — **أَمِين** or **آمِن**—its forms—the *prep.*

and *gen.* why called a verbal *n.*—the verbal *n.* has no place in inflection—it is not in the place of the *nom.*—it has lost its original place in inflection—nor is it in the place of the *acc.*—it is transferred from its original meaning to the meaning of the *v.* In the same way as proper names are transferred—it denotes the *meaning*, not merely the *expression*, of the *v.*—the *v.*

sometimes becomes a verbal *n.*—**كَذَبَ** and

**كَذَبَ عَلَيْكَ**—government of the verbal *ns.*—the **ب** is often *red.* in their *obj.*—dispute as to whether they may be preceded by their *accs.*—the verbal *n.* is not *pre.*—the *aor.* is not governed in the *subj.* in the *correl.* of the requisitive verbal *n.*, but is governed in the *apoc.*—the verbal *ns.* are mostly *i. q.* the *imp.*—are more intensive and *corrob.* in meaning than the corresponding *ns.*—and, when enunciatory, contain the sense of *wonder*—they have no sign for the attached *pron.* governed by them in the *nom.*—affixion of the **ك** of allocation and of the Tanwīn to them is restricted to hearsay—the **ك** attached to them is sometimes a *n.* governed in the *gen.*, and sometimes a *p.* of allocation—according to the majority, the Tanwīn affixed to them indicates *indeterminateness*—the verbal *ns.* in the state of determination belong to the

- class of *n.* made *det.* by the <sup>أَلْ</sup> denoting *knowledge*—according to ISk and Jh, the Tanwīn affixed to verbal *ns.* indicates that they are continuous with what follows them, not paused upon—classification of the verbal *ns.* — <sup>أَرَسَ</sup> —  
<sup>وَيْكٌ</sup> — <sup>وَيْ</sup> — <sup>وَاهَا</sup> — <sup>وَا</sup> — <sup>بُجُلٌ</sup> — <sup>قَطَا</sup> — <sup>قَدَ</sup>  
<sup>وَيْ</sup> <sup>كَانَ</sup> or <sup>وَيْكٌ</sup> <sup>أَنَّ</sup> ... 652—671
- § 188. <sup>رَوَيْدٌ</sup> —ambiguous constructions and various versions ... 674—676
- § 189. <sup>هَلَمْ</sup> —is made uniform by the Hījāzīs in all numbers and genders, but conjugated by the Banū Tamīm as an *imp. v.* —is *trans.* and *intrans.* —  
<sup>أَهْلَمْ</sup> and <sup>أَهْلَمْ</sup> ... 676—678
- § 190. <sup>هَآ</sup> —its *dial. vars.*—three of these are aplastic *vs.* ... 679—680
- § 191. <sup>حَيْهَلٌ</sup> — its *dia<sup>l</sup>. vars.*—forms peculiar to pause — <sup>حَيْهَلٌ</sup> —sense and government of <sup>حَيْهَلٌ</sup> —  
its assumption of the *pron.* — <sup>حَيْهَلُكَ</sup> — <sup>حَى</sup> —  
and <sup>هَلْ</sup> why combined — <sup>حَى</sup> used alone —  
<sup>هَلْ</sup> or <sup>هَلْ</sup> used alone ... 680—684
- § 192. <sup>بَلْ</sup> is (1) a verbal *n.* — (2) an *inf. n.* — <sup>بَلْ</sup> —  
(3) a *n. i. q.* <sup>كَيْفَ</sup> —case of what follows it—  
nature of its Fath—*ex.* with versions exhibiting  
all 3 constructions — <sup>مِنْ</sup> <sup>بَلْ</sup> or <sup>مِنْ</sup> <sup>بَلْ</sup> —  
<sup>مِنْ</sup> <sup>بَلْ</sup> occurs in tradition—different versions of  
this tradition—(4) a *prep.* ... 684—686

§ 193. **فُعَالٍ** — it is (1) an *imp.* verbal *n.*—universal, or, at all events, frequent, in the *tril.*—its occurrence in the Revelation—it is rare in the *quad.*, being then **فُعَالٍ** — refutation of the theory that it is made to deviate from the verbal *imp.* for the sake of *intensiveness* and is *fem*—it is intensive, however, like all verbal *ns.*—so are **فُعَالٍ** the *inf. n.* and **فُعَالٍ** the *ep.*—(2) an *inf. n.*—refutation of the theory that it is made to deviate from a *det. fem. inf. n.*—there is no evidence of determinateness in **فُعَالٍ** — nor in other instances of this **فُعَالٍ** — vacillation of the GG about the gender of all the measures of **فُعَالٍ**, *imp*, *inf. n.*, *ep.*, and proper name—(3) a *fem ep.*—this *ep.* does not occur in the *masc.*, is always used without a qualified, and is of 2 kinds, (a) used only in the *voc.*, except by poetic license—this kind, like the *imp.* **فُعَالٍ**, may be regularly formed from every *tril. att.* completely plastic *v.*—and does not occur as a generic proper name—(b) used in the *non-voc.*, (a) mostly as generic proper names, and therefore *det.*—(b) sometimes merely as *eps.*—(4) a personal proper name of a *fem.*—this kind of proper name is coined—difference between it and the generic proper name mentioned in 3, b, a—it is always *fem.*—but is sometimes used as a name for a man ...

687—698

§ 194. **فُعَالٍ** when an *imp.*, *inf. n.*, or *ep.*, has its **ف** pronounced with Kasr—unless it be used as a personal proper name, in which case, if a name for a *masc.*, it is declined as a diptote, and some-

- times as a triptote, and, if a name for a *fem.*, it is treated like *فُعَالٍ* when a personal proper name—the *ف* in the *imp.* is pronounced with *Fath* by the Banū Asad—the *inf. ns.* and *ops.* are *uninfl.* by common consent—the generic proper names are *uninfl.*—the personal proper names of *fems.* have 3 *dial. vars.* ... 698—701
- § 195. *هَيْهَاتَ* — its *dial. vars.*—its number—reasons for the different vowels of the *ت*—the final how written when pronounced with *Damm* ... 701—703
- § 196. *شَتَّانَ* — requires 2 *ags.*— *شَتَّانَ مَا* is allowable—and *شَتَّانَ مَا بَيْنَ*, though it is less frequent and chaste—but not *شَتَّانَ بَيْنَ* ... 703—706
- § 197. *أَفَّ* — its *dial. vars.*—its final vowel, and its Tanwīn ... 706—707
- § 198. These *ns.* are *det.* and *indet.*—signs of the *det.* and *indet.*—classification of these *ns.* as (1) always *det.*—(2) always *indet.*—*أَيْهَ* or *أَيْهَ* — *هَيْهَ* and *هَيْهَ* — *فُدَّ* — (3) *det.* and *indet.* — *أَيْهَ* — the Tanwīn affixed to these *ns.*—theory that the verbal *ns.* are all *det.* ... 707—709
- § 199. *Advs.* and *preps.* as verbal *ns.*—their *gen.* is a *pron.* —*pers.* of the *pron.* — *عِنْدَكَ*, *إِلَيْكَ*, and *مَكَانَكَ* — *أَمَامَكَ* and *دِرْأَمَكَ* — *قُونَكَ* — question whether *مَكَانَكَ* and the like are verbal *ns.* — *عَالِي* and *إِلَى* — *إِلَيْكَ* and *عَلَيْكَ* — an explicit *n.* governed in the *gen.* by *عَلَى* — dis-

pute whether *instigation* by *adv.* of place and  
by *preps.* is regular or restricted to hearsay—  
position of the *pron.* attached to these words—  
their *ag.*—case of the *corrob.* after them ... 709—713

§ 200. Definition of the *ej*.—classification of the *ej*s.—these expressions why named *ej*s.—they are treated as words, and coordinated with *ns*.—the Tanwin affixed to some of them—they are all *uninfl.*—reason of their uninflectedness—when they occur constructed, they may be *infl.* or *uninfl.*, in-

lection being frequent with  $\text{ᑭᑭ}$ , and necessary with Tanwū—*ej*s. imitating the sounds of human beings, dumb animals, or inanimate substances—*ej*s, wherewith brutes are cried to—*ej*s. indicative of the speaker's mental states—

وَيْلَهُ or وَيْلَهُ — وَيْت , وَيَس , وَيَح , وَيَل  
 وَيَكُ or وَيَكُن or وَيَكُنْ ...

### THE UNINFLECTED ADVERBS.

§ 201. Some *adv.* are *uninfl.*—their terminations—the *adv.* cut off from prothesis—enumeration of the *adv.* so cut off—others may not be added by analogy—the *post. n.* or *prop.* when suppressible—reason of the uninflectedness of the *adv.* cut

off from prothesis—and of **أَذُ**, **حَيْثُ**, and **أَذَا**

—reason of the inflectedness of <sup>ع</sup> بعض and <sup>ك</sup> كل when the *post.* is suppressed—these *adv.* are preferably *uninfl.*, but allowably *infl.* when pronounced with Tanwin as a compensation for the *post.*—there is no difference in sense between their *infl.* and *uninfl.* forms—contrary opinion that their *infl.* forms do not imply the sense of prothesis—these *ns.* are *uninfl.* upon Damm in

1 state, and *impl* in 3 — <sup>مِنْ</sup> <sup>فَدَامَ</sup> —  
Tannin with the sign of the *rom.* or *acv.* in  
these *advs.*—they are named “finals”—<sup>فُلْ</sup> and  
<sup>عُضْ</sup>. when cut off from prothesis, are not so  
named—<sup>عُلْ</sup> — it is *uninfl.* upon Damm or *impl.*  
—its *dial. vars.*—the *ى* of <sup>عُلْ</sup> is eluded in <sup>عَلْ</sup> —  
vowel of the <sup>ف</sup> in <sup>عَلُو</sup> —and of the <sup>ل</sup> in <sup>عَلُو</sup> —  
the finals why *uninfl.* upon Damm—<sup>لَا</sup> <sup>غَيْرَ</sup> or  
<sup>لَيْسَ</sup> <sup>غَيْرَ</sup> and <sup>حَسْبَ</sup> are treated like the *ades.*  
cut off from prothesis—<sup>غَيْرَ</sup> — constructions  
allowable with <sup>غَيْرَ</sup> preceded by <sup>لَيْسَ</sup> — <sup>لَا</sup> <sup>غَيْرَ</sup> —  
— <sup>غَيْرَ</sup> is assimilated to the final *ades.*—but  
only after <sup>لَا</sup> and <sup>لَيْسَ</sup> — <sup>غَيْرَ</sup> after <sup>لَيْسَ</sup> is i.q.  
<sup>حَسْبَ</sup> — it is used as an *indet. cp.*—and  
as a *prim. substantive*—objection to its being  
a verbal *n.*—<sup>حَسْبَ</sup> — its *post.* why suppressed  
— <sup>حَسْبَ</sup> why *uninfl.* upon Damm—*advs. pre.*  
to *props.*—the *n.* of *time* is generally *pre.* to the  
verbal *prop.*, sometimes to the nominal—the *n.*  
of *time*, when not in sense an *adv.* to the *inf. n.*  
of the *prop.*, is not used except with an infinitival  
*p.* before the *prop.* — <sup>ذُو</sup> — <sup>أَيَّةَ</sup> and <sup>رَيْتَ</sup> —  
order of the two terms of the *prop.* immediately  
following <sup>حَيْثُ</sup> and <sup>أَنَّا</sup> when one of these terms  
is a *v.*—<sup>غَيْرَ</sup> and <sup>مَتَلْ</sup> are sometimes *pre.* to a

*prop.* headed by an infinitival *p*—the *adv.* also are said by the KK to be *pre.* to <sup>١٢٣</sup>أَنْ and <sup>١٢٤</sup>أَنْ—alleged qualifiability of the *adv. pre.* to *props.*—determinateness or indeterminateness of this *adv.*—the

*n.* of *time* or <sup>١٢٥</sup>حَيْثُ, even if not an *adv.*, is *pre.*

to the *prop.*—<sup>١٢٦</sup>حَيْثُ, <sup>١٢٧</sup>حَيْثُ, and <sup>١٢٨</sup>سَاعَةً —  
 إِذْ — the *post. prop.* may not contain a *pron.*

relating to the *pre. adv.*—the *cop.* when necessary in the *prop.* following an *adv.*—anomalous insertion of a *cop.* in the *prop. post.* to an *adv.*—the *adv.* necessarily *pre.* to *props.* must be *uninfl.* —the *sing.* and *pl.*, but not the *du.*, of the *adv.*

allowably *pre.* to the *prop.* or to <sup>١٢٩</sup>إِذْ may be *uninfl.* upon *Fath*—so may <sup>١٣٠</sup>مِثْلُ with <sup>١٣١</sup>مَا — and

<sup>١٣٢</sup>غَيْرُ with <sup>١٣٣</sup>أَنْ or <sup>١٣٤</sup>أَنْ ... .. 721—744

§ 202. <sup>١٣٥</sup>حَيْثُ or <sup>١٣٦</sup>حَيْثُ is *uninfl.*—its terminations—<sup>١٣٧</sup>حَيْثُ

is *infl.* by some—its meaning—how parsed—it

does not occur as *sub.* of <sup>١٣٨</sup>أَنْ — is always *pre.* to

a *prop.*, more often verbal—extraordinary prefixion to a single term—more extraordinary

prefixion to a suppressed *prop.*—<sup>١٣٩</sup>حَيْثُ, when

*pre.* to a single term, is *infl.* by some—<sup>١٤٠</sup>حَيْثُ —

proof that <sup>١٤١</sup>حَيْثُ sometimes denotes *time* ... 744—748

§ 203. <sup>١٤٢</sup>مَنْ and <sup>١٤٣</sup>مَنْ — are peculiar to *time*—their meanings

when they are *ns.*—what follows them—how

parsed when followed by a *n.* in the *gen.*—are *ns.*

when governing a single *n.* in the *nom.*, or when

followed by a *prop.*—how parsed when followed



by a *n.* in the *nom.*—or by a verbal or nominal *prop.*—are *uninfl.*—reason of their uninflected-

ness—their terminations—the *o. f.* of <sup>أ</sup>ذ ... 718—752

§ 204. <sup>أ</sup>ذ is (1) a *n.* denoting *past time*—how used—(2) a *n.* denoting *future time*—(3) causative—a *p.* or *adv.*, according to different opinions—*ces.* in favor of the 1st opinion—(4) denotative of *suddenness of occurrence*—generally occurring after <sup>أ</sup>بَيَّنَّا or <sup>أ</sup>بَيَّنَّا and variously said to be an *adv.* of *place* or *time*, a *p.* denoting *suddenness of occurrence*, and a *rel. p.*—2 other meanings mentioned for <sup>أ</sup>ذ, in both of which it appears to be a *p.*—<sup>أ</sup>ذ is always *pre.* to a *prop.*, nominal or verbal—but is not prefixed to a *n.* followed by *apoc. v.*—suppression of one term of the *prop.*—<sup>أ</sup>ذ ذَاكَ and <sup>أ</sup>ذ نَحْنُ — and of the whole *prop.*—<sup>أ</sup>ذ or <sup>أ</sup>ذَا and <sup>أ</sup>ذَوْنَهُ — <sup>أ</sup>ذ does not denote *condition* unless it be restrained by <sup>أ</sup>م from prefixion—<sup>أ</sup>ذَمَّا—a *p.* or *adv.*, according to different opinions—its government of the *apoc.* is rare, but not a poetic license—<sup>أ</sup>ذ (1) denotes *suddenness of occurrence*—this differs from the *cond.* <sup>أ</sup>ذ in being peculiar to nominal *props.*, in not needing a *correl.*, nor occurring at the beginning of the sentence, and in meaning the *present*—and is variously said to be a *p.*, an *adv.* of *place*, and an *adv.* of *time*—its *op.*, if it be an *adv.*—the *enunc.* with it—<sup>أ</sup>ذ itself the *enunc.*—<sup>أ</sup>ذَا <sup>أ</sup>ذَرَجْتُ فَذَا — <sup>أ</sup>ذَا <sup>أ</sup>ذَرَجْتُ or <sup>أ</sup>ذَا <sup>أ</sup>ذَرَجْتُ regarded as an

*adv.* of *time*, but still apparently made *enunc.* of a concrete *n.*—*هِيَ* *فَإِذَا* *هِيَ* or *أَيَّاهَا* — this *إِذَا* is used like the *ف* in the *correl.* of the condition — (2) denotes *something else*—this differs from the 1st *إِذَا* in being an *adv.* of the *future*, in implying the sense of *condition*, and in being peculiar to prefixion to verbal *props.*—tense of the *v.* after it—the *cond.* *إِذَا* is not prefixed to an *inch.*, whether the *inch.* be, or be not, followed by a *v.* —and does not govern the *apoc.*, except in poetry—exclusion of this *إِذَا* from *adverbiality*, *futurity*, and *conditionality*—when no longer *cond.*, it may still be followed by 2 *props.*—what governs it in the *acc.*, whether it be *cond.* or *non-cond.*—the *ف* in the *correl.* of the *non-cond.* *إِذَا* — the *cond.* *إِذَا* may have for its *apod.* a nominal *prop.* without a *ف* — and be followed by a nominal *prop.* devoid of *v.*—*حَتَّى* *إِذَا* — *إِذَا*—*إِذَا* and *إِذَا* denoting *suddenness of occurrence* in the *correl.* of *بَيْنَمَا* and *بَيْنَمَا* — formation of *بَيْنَمَا* and *بَيْنَمَا* — sense and government of *بَيْن* in them—*كَلَّمَا* — tense of the *v.* after *بَيْنَمَا*, *بَيْنَمَا*, and *كَلَّمَا* — *بَيْن* and *كَلَّ* here may be *uninfl.* —construction of *بَيْنَا*, *بَيْنَمَا*, and *كَلَّمَا* with their 2 *props.*—*إِذَا* and *إِذَا* why prefixed to the *correl.* of *بَيْنَا* and *بَيْنَمَا* — *كَلَّ* and *بَيْن* in *كَلَّمَا*

- and <sup>أ</sup>بَيْنَمَا may be *infl.*—parsing of <sup>أ</sup>إِذَا and <sup>أ</sup>إِذَا in the *correl.* of <sup>أ</sup>بَيْنَا and <sup>أ</sup>بَيْنَمَا—and of <sup>أ</sup>إِذَا in the *correl.* of <sup>أ</sup>إِذَا, <sup>أ</sup>لَمَّا, and <sup>أ</sup>أَنْ—<sup>أ</sup>إِذَا denoting *suddenness of occurrence* elsewhere than in the *correl.* of <sup>أ</sup>بَيْنَا and <sup>أ</sup>بَيْنَمَا—<sup>أ</sup>بَيْنَمَا may be *pre.* to an *infl. n.*, contrary to <sup>أ</sup>بَيْنَمَا ... .. 752—778
- § 205. <sup>أ</sup>لَدُن—its *dial. vars.*—its government—<sup>أ</sup>لَدُن <sup>أ</sup>عُدُوهُ  
—no *n.* but <sup>أ</sup>عُدُوهُ is governed in the *acc.* after <sup>أ</sup>لَدُن—<sup>أ</sup>لَدُن — <sup>أ</sup>لَدَى — difference between it and <sup>أ</sup>لَدُن—<sup>أ</sup>لَدُن — and between it and <sup>أ</sup>عِنْدَ — there is no proof of its uninflectedness—its <sup>أ</sup> ... .. 778—781
- § 206. <sup>أ</sup>الآن — is an *adv.* of time, *uninfl.* upon Fath—the <sup>أ</sup>أَلْ prefixed to it—how it is made *det.*—reason of its uninflectedness—it is sometimes *infl.*—its *vars.*—<sup>أ</sup>أَمْسَ — its termination when it means *a specified day*, and is not *pre.*, nor synarthrous, nor formed into a *du.* or broken *pl.* or *dim.*—its inflection when it is used as a name for a man—and when it means *some day or other of the past days*, or is *pre.* or synarthrous, or is formed into a *du.* or broken *pl.* or *dim.*—its uninflectedness when it is anarthrous, and means *a specified day*, but is used as an *adv.*—<sup>أ</sup>قَطًّا — its usages—it is *uninfl.*—reason of its uninflectedness—its terminations—its *dial. vars.*—<sup>أ</sup>عَرَضَ or <sup>أ</sup>عَرَضَ — its usages—when it is *infl.* and when *uninfl.*—reason of its uninflectedness—its terminations—<sup>أ</sup>لَمَّا — it is a *p.*—or an *adv.*

of *time*—reason of its uninflectedness—attempted refutation of its nominalty—the *v.* following it—its *correl.*—apparent omission of its 2 *vs.*—  
 مَعَ — لَهُ — its formation—لَهُ and لَهُ said to be *uninfl.*—reason for its uninflectedness—it is really *infl.*—the اِ in مَعًا — اِ is *uninfl.*—its termination—مَتَى — is also a *p* or a *n syn.* with وَسَطًا — is *uninfl.*—its termination—يَتِمُّ and مَتَى — distinction between مَتَى and اِذَا — اِذَا — is *uninfl.*—reason of its uninflectedness—its termination—its derivation—its *dial. vars.*—parsing of *cond.* and *interrog. ns.* and the like—the *enunc.* of the *cond. inch.*—the *correl.* of the *cond. inch.* needs a *cop*—the *interrog.* or *cond. reg.* of the *v.* or its like must precede its *op.*—the *op.* of مَتَى and every *cond. adv.* ... 785—804

- § 207. كَيْفَ is a *n.*—treated as an *adv.* by many—dispute as to whether it be an *adv.* or a plain *n.*—how renderable—its usages—said to occur as a *con.*—is *uninfl.*—reason of its uninflectedness—its termination—اِنِّى — كَيْفَ — condition of its occurrence in the sense of كَيْفَ or مَتَى — it is *uninfl.*—reason of its uninflectedness—its termination 804—810

#### THE COMPOUNDS.

- § 208. IH's definition—includes such as سَيَبْرِيه — excludes such as اَعْبَدُ اللهَ and اَقْبَلْ — excludes part of the defined also—amendment of the definition—classification of the *comps.*—dispute as to classification of certain *comps.* ... 811—812

	Page.
§ 209. Distinction between the 2 kinds of <i>comp.</i> ...	812—813
§ 210. The <i>num.</i> exceeding 10—the ع of عَشْر sometimes made quiescent—this <i>num.</i> , when synarthrous or <i>pre.</i> , remains <i>uninfl.</i> —dispute as to uninflectedness of the <i>pre.</i> —treatment of this <i>num.</i> when used as a name for a man ...	813—814
§ 211. Classification of the synthetic <i>comps.</i> <i>uninfl.</i> upon Fath—all synthetic <i>comps.</i> used as <i>ds. s.</i> —synthetic composition in what is not an <i>adv.</i> or <i>d. s.</i> — o. f. of حَيْصٌ بَيْصٌ — its <i>dial. vars.</i> ...	814—818
§ 212. خَاِزٌ بَاِزٌ — its <i>dial. vars.</i> and meanings ...	818—820
§ 213. بَادِيٌ بَدَاٌ or بَادِيٌ بَدِيٌ — is used as a <i>d. s.</i> —its <i>dial. vars.</i> ...	820
§ 214. اَيْدِيٌ سَبَاٌ or اَيْدِيٌ سَبَاٌ — its <i>dial. vars.</i> —is a <i>d. s.</i> —the Hamza of سَبَاٌ omitted ...	820—821
§ 215. حَضَرٌ مَوْتٌ, قَالِيٌ قَلَاٌ — its <i>dial. vars.</i> — حَضَرٌ مَوْتٌ, and the like—the مَعْدِي of مَعْدِي, when <i>pre.</i> , is made quiescent in the <i>acc.</i> —كَرْبٌ in مَعْدِي كَرْبٌ in كَرْبٌ — dispute as to classification of قَالِيٌ قَلَاٌ ...	821—822

#### THE UNINFLECTED METONYMS.

§ 216. Definition of metonymy—signification of the <i>met.</i> denoting an <i>expression</i> —all the <i>interrog.</i> and <i>cond.</i> <i>ns.</i> are <i>met.</i> —being used for <i>unlimited particular</i> .
--

	<i>things</i> —all <i>met.</i> are not <i>uninfl.</i> —the <i>uninfl. met.</i> —the <i>interrog.</i> and <i>cond. ns.</i> why not reckoned here—the <i>met.</i> are like the <i>adv.</i> in being <i>infl.</i> and <i>uninfl.</i> ... ..	823—825
§ 217.	$\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$ — is <i>interrog.</i> and enunciatory—both denote <i>number</i> and <i>numbered</i> , and each needs a <i>sp.</i> — case and number of the <i>sp.</i> —points of agreement between the <i>interrog.</i> and enunciatory—and of difference ... ..	825—827
§ 218.	Parsing of $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$ ... ..	827—828
§ 219.	Suppression of the <i>sp.</i> ... ..	828—829
§ 220.	Number of the <i>sp.</i> of the <i>interrog.</i> $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$ — of the <i>n.</i> coupled to the <i>sp.</i> of the <i>interrog.</i> —of the <i>sp.</i> of the enunciatory ... ..	829—830
§ 221.	Separation of $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$ from its <i>sp.</i> —case of the <i>sp.</i> of the separated <i>interrog.</i> $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$ — and of the <i>sp.</i> of the separated enunciatory $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$ —treatment of the <i>sp.</i> of the separated enunciatory $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$ , when the separa- tion is by a <i>trans. v.</i> —and of the <i>sp.</i> of the separated <i>interrog.</i> $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$ , when the <i>sp.</i> , if $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$ were not separated from it, would be governed in the <i>gen.</i> ... ..	830—831
§ 222.	Number and gender of $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$ —and of the <i>pron.</i> relat- ing to it—this <i>pron.</i> ought not to a be <i>du.</i> ...	832
§ 223.	$\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$ is peculiar to <i>indets.</i> —apparent determination of its <i>sp.</i> —and of the <i>n.</i> coupled to its <i>sp.</i> ...	832—833
§ 224.	Case of the <i>sp.</i> of the <i>interrog.</i> $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$ — the <i>gen.</i> when allowable in this <i>sp.</i> —the <i>sp.</i> of the enunciatory	

- كَمْ is sometimes governed in the *acc.* without separation—<sup>و</sup>كَمْ ... .. 833—835
- § 225. The *sp.* how governed in the *gen.* when كَمْ is *interrog.* —and when كَمْ is enunciatory—<sup>مِنْ</sup> prefixed to the *sp.*—كَمْ when construed to be pronounced with Tanwin ... .. 835—836
- § 226. كَذَا and كَآيِنٌ — points of agreement between كَذَا and كَمْ — and of difference—كَذَا as a *met.* for the expression occurring in narration—the uncompounded كَذَا — هَكَذَا — points of agreement between كَآيِنٌ and كَمْ — and of difference—*di. vars.* of كَآيِنٌ ... .. 836—840
- § 227. ذِيَّتْ and كَيْتْ — their terminations—their pausal form—they are often used according to the *o. f.*—<sup>كَيْتْ</sup> — reason of their uninflectedness—they are always repeated with the *con.* و — distinction between them ... .. 840—841

## CHAPTER VI.

## THE DUAL NOUN.

- § 228. Definition of dualization—and of the *du.*—*o. f.* of the *du.* and *pl.*—corresponding definition of the *du.*—demonstration of the theory that the *o. f.* is coupling—coupling when allowable instead of dualization—*multiplication* sometimes denoted by repetition without coupling or by dualization—conditions of dualization—*ns.* not dualized—exceptions to some of these conditions—classifi.

- cation of the *du.*—the form of the *sing.* is generally preserved—elision of the *š* of feminization—of the *و* of the *du.*—and of its *ل* ... 842—846
- § 229. The form of the *sing.* when unaltered in the *du.*—and when altered—dualization of the abbreviated, when its *ل* is 3<sup>rd</sup>—different opinions on the mode of converting the *rad. ل* and the *ل* whose *o. f.* is unknown—modes allowable when the *ل* has 2 *o. fs.*—dualization of the abbreviated when its *ل* is 4<sup>th</sup> or upwards—مَذْرُوءَاتٍ — elision of the *ل* in the *du.* of the abbreviated transcending 4 letters—فَهْرَاقٍ and خَوْرَاقٍ — summary of the rules for converting the *ل* of the abbreviated in the *du.*—summary of the anomalous *dus.* in the abbreviated ... 846—850
- § 230. The *ns.* whose final is Hamza are prolonged and unprolonged—definition of the prolonged—its Hamza—dualization of the prolonged when its Hamza is (1) substituted for the *ل* of feminization—(2) *rad.*—(3) denotative of co-ordination and (4) converted from a *rad. و* or *ي* — كَسَائِيَانِ — and ثُنَائِيَانِ — elision of the *ل* and Hamza of feminization—summary of the anomalous *dus.* in the prolonged—definition and dualization of the unprolonged ... 850—853
- § 231. Dualization of the *n.* arbitrarily curtailed of its final—the *n.* whose *و* is elided for a necessitating cause ... 853—855
- § 232. Dualization of the *quasi-pl.* and of the broken, but not ultimate, *pl.*—dualization is easier in the *quasi-pl.* than in the broken *pl.*—and is not allowable in the ultimate *pl.* ... 855—856



§ 233.	Number preferred in the <i>pre.</i> , (1) when 2 parts are literally or ideally <i>pre.</i> to their 2 wholes, ( <i>a</i> ) if the 2 wholes be uniform in letter—the <i>du.</i> disapproved unless omission of dualization would lead to ambiguity—the <i>pl.</i> why preferred to the <i>sing.</i> —difference of opinion as to the number allowable when each whole contains more than one of each part— <i>ex.</i> of the <i>du.</i> and <i>pl.</i> , and <i>ex.</i> of the <i>du.</i> —( <i>b</i> ) if the 2 wholes be separated by a <i>con.</i> —(2) when the <i>pre.</i> is not part of the <i>post. du.</i> —number of the <i>pron.</i> , <i>qual.</i> , <i>dem.</i> , and the like, belonging to the <i>pre. n.</i> whose letter differs from its sense—the <i>sing.</i> substituted for the <i>du.</i> or <i>pl.</i> —the <i>du.</i> for the <i>sing.</i> —the <i>pl.</i> for the <i>sing.</i> or <i>du.</i> — <i>ex.</i> of the <i>sing.</i> and <i>pl.</i> for the <i>du.</i>	...	...	...	856—861
--------	---	-----	-----	-----	---------

## CHAPTER V.

### THE UNINFLECTED NOUN.

§ 159. Uninflectedness is the inseparability of the termination of the word from one state, literally or constructively, like the inseparability of هُوَ <sup>اَءَ</sup> from Kasra, مَنْ <sup>اَءَ</sup> from Damma, and اَيْنَ <sup>اَءَ</sup> from Fatha (Sh). The *uninfl. n.* is the one whose final's quiescence or vowel is not by reason of an *op.* (M,MM). The *uninfl.* [*n.* (Jm)] is what (1) is related to the *orig. uninfl.*, [vid. the *p.*, *pret.* *v.*, and *imp.* without the **ل**, which relation is detailed (below) by the author of the M (Jm)] ; (2) occurs unconstructed: [being of 2 kinds, either *uninfl.* from the lack of the motive for inflection, vid. construction, like *ns.* enumerated, as اَحَدٌ اِثْنَانِ ثَلَاثَةٌ (321), اَلْفٌ بَا تَا ثَا , and زَيْدٌ ; or *uninfl.* from the presence of the preventive of inflection, notwithstanding the existence of the motive for it, that preventive being resemblance (of the *n.*) to the *p.*, *pret.*, or *imp.*, or its being a verbal *n.* (187) (R):] and its predicament is that its termination does not vary because of the variation of the *ops.* (IH). It is (1) permanent, vid. (a) what implies the sense of the *p.*, like اَيْنَ <sup>اَءَ</sup> [206], مَتَى <sup>اَءَ</sup> [below], and كَيْفَ <sup>اَءَ</sup> [207]; (b) what resembles it, like اَلَّذِي <sup>اَءَ</sup> [below], اَلَّتِي <sup>اَءَ</sup>, and the like : (2) accidental, vid. (a) the [*n.*] *pre.* to the **ي** of the 1st pers. [129], as غُلَامِي <sup>اَءَ</sup> [below] ; (b) the aprothetic *det.*

*voc.*, as <sup>أَ</sup>يَا <sup>زَيْدُ</sup> [48]; (c) the aprothetic *indet.* with the generic *neg.* <sup>لَا</sup>, as <sup>لَا</sup> رَجُلٌ فِي الدَّارِ [99]; (d) the *comp.*, as <sup>عَشْرَ</sup> خَمْسَةَ عَشْرَ [210]; (e) what the *post.* is suppressed from, vid. <sup>فَوْقَ</sup>, <sup>تَحْتَ</sup>, <sup>بَعْدَ</sup>, <sup>قَبْلَ</sup>, and the rest of the 6 relative locations [128, 201] (MM). The cause of its uninflectedness is its relation to what has [*orig.* (AAz)] no declinability in any way, near or remote, [like the *pret. vs.*, *imp.* of the 2nd *pers.*, and *ps.*, which are *orig.* so constituted as to have no declinability, contrary to the *uninfl. ns.*, whose indeclinability is adventitious, not original (AAz),] through (1) implying its sense, like <sup>أَمْسِي</sup> and <sup>أَيُّ</sup> [206]; (2) resembling it, like the [*prons.* (161) and] vague *ns.* [262]; (3) occurring in its place, like <sup>نَزَالُ</sup> [193]; (4) conforming to what occurs in its place, like <sup>فَنَجَارُ</sup> and <sup>فَسَاقُ</sup> [194]; (5) occurring in the place of what resembles it, like the *voc.* pronounced with Damm [48]; (6) being prefixed to it, as in LXX. 11. [below] and <sup>هَذَا</sup> <sup>يَوْمَ</sup> <sup>لَا</sup> LXXVII. 35. *This will be a day when they shall not speak* in the readings with Fath [of the

(AAz)], <sup>لَمْ</sup> <sup>يَمْنَعِ</sup> <sup>الشَّرْبُ</sup> <sup>أَلْخَ</sup> [90], and

عَلَى حِينٍ عَاتَبْتَ الْمَشِيبَ عَلَى الصَّبِيِّ  
وَقُلْتَ أَلَمْ أَصْغِ وَالشَّيْبَ وَأَزْعِ

by AnNābigha (M) adhDhubyānī, *At the time when I reproved hoariness for the passing away of youth, and said, What! have I not yet become sober when hoariness is hindering (from sport)?* (J). The cause of uninflectedness is restricted to resemblance to the *p.*, according to IM, who mentions that the *n.* resembles the *p.* in (1) constitution, as when the *n.* is constituted of (a) one letter, like the ت in ضَرَبْتُ [161]; (b) two letters, like the ٱ in أَكْرَمْنَا : (2) sense, vid. what resembles a *p.* (a) existing, like مَتَى [206], which is used to denote *interrogation*, like the Hamza, and *condition*, like أُنِ ; (b) non-existent, like هُنَا , because *demonstration*, being a meaning, ought to have a *p.* constituted to indicate it [171], so that the *dems.* are *uninfl.* because of their resemblance to a supplied *p.*: (3) acting as a *subst.* for the *v.* and not being impressible by the *op.*, like the verbal *ns.*, as دَرَأَ [193], which is *uninfl.* because of its resemblance to the *p.* in governing and not being governed by anything else; but this is based upon the opinion that the verbal *ns.* have no place in inflection [187]: (4) permanent need, like the conjunct *ns.*, as اَلَّذِي [176], which, always needing the *conj.* [177], resemble the *p.* in permanence of need [497] (IA). The [*pre.* (DM)] *n.* gains uninflectedness [from the *post.*, when *uninfl.* (DM),] by prothesis [111], when the *pre.* is (1) vague, [but not a *n.* of time (DM),] like

وَحِيلَ بَيْنَهُمْ وَبَيْنَ [بَيْنَ] , مِثْلُ , غَيْرُ , whence دُونَ , XXXIV. 53. *And their union and the union of what they shall long for shall be obstructed and* وَمِنَّا دُونَ ذَلِكَ LXXII. 11. *And of us is the inferior of that*, as Akh says, the reading لَقَدْ تَقَطَّعَ بَيْنَكُمْ VI. 94. *Assuredly your union hath become dis severed*, as Akh says, which is confirmed by the reading with the *nom.*, LI. 23. [518], the reading أَنْ يَصِيبَكُمْ مِثْلُ مَا أَصَابَ XI. 93. *That the like of what befell [the people of Noah &c.] should befall you*, وَأَنْ مَا مِثْلَهُمُ الْخ [107], and لَمْ يَمْنَعْ [107], and الشَّرْبُ الْخ : whereas, if the *pre.* be not vague, it is not *uninfl.*; while the saying of Jj and those who agree with him, that [the *pre. n. in*] غَلَامِي [above] and the like is *uninfl.*, is refuted, [because غَلَام is not a vague *n. (DM)*], and [because it (DM)] entails uninflectedness of [the *pre. n. in*] غَلَامَكَ and غَلَامَةٌ, which no one maintains : (2) a vague [*n. of*] time, the *post.* being (a) أَنْ , as وَمِنْ خِزْيٍ XI. 69. *And We saved them from the ignominy of that day* and مِنْ عَذَابٍ يَوْمَئِذٍ LXX. 11. *From the chastisement of that day*, both read with the *gen.* and Fath of يَوْم ; (b) an *uninfl. v.*, whether the uninflectedness be original, as in عَلَى حِينٍ عَاتَبْتُ الْخ , or adventitious [402, 406], as in

لَا جُنْدَيْنِ مِنْهُمْ قُلُوبِي تَحْلُمَا \* عَلَى حِينٍ يُسْتَصْبِيحُ كُلُّ حَلِيمٍ

[ *I will surely draw away from them my heart, by endeavouring to acquire staidness, at the time when they seek to befool every staid man (Jsh)*], both related with Fath [of حِينٍ (DM)], which is superior to inflection according to IM, and inferior according to IU: whereas, if the *post.* be an *infl. v.* or nominal *prop.*, the BB say that inflection is necessary; but the correct view is that uninflectedness is allowable, whence the reading of Nāfi 'هَذَا يَوْمَ الْخ' V. 119. [1], the reading of others than Abū 'Amr and Ibn Kathīr يَوْمَ لَا تَمْلِكُ نَفْسٌ LXXXII. 19. (*It is*) *the day when a soul shall not have in its power*, [i. e. هُوَ يَوْمٌ (DM),]

إِذَا قُلْتُ هَذَا حِينٍ أَسْلُو يَهِيْجُنِيْ

نَسِيمُ الصَّبَا مِنْ حَيْثُ يَطْلُعُ الْفَجْرُ

[by Abū Ṣakhr alHudhalī, *When I say "This is the time when I shall forget", the breeze of the east wind from where the dawn rises stirs me (Jsh)*], and

أَلَمْ تَعْلَمِي يَا عَمْرُكَ اللَّهُ أُنْزِي \* كَرِيمٌ عَلَى حِينِ الْكَرَامِ قَلِيلٌ

[*Didst thou not know (O, I pray God to prolong thy life!) that I am generous at the time when the generous are few? (Jsh)*], both [verses] being related with Fath

(ML) of حِين (DM). The vague [*n.* of] time, i. e. what does not indicate any time particularly, as وَقْتُ حِينٍ, سَاعَةُ حِينٍ, and زَمَانُ حِينٍ, may be *pre.* to the *prop.*; and then may be *infl.* or *uninfl.* upon *Path*, uninflectedness being preferable to inflection when the *post.* is a verbal *prop.* whose *v.* is *uninfl.*, and the converse being the case when the *post.* is a verbal *prop.* whose *v.* is *infl.* or a nominal *prop.* (Sh). Such *ns.* as are necessarily *pre.* to the *prop.* are permanently *uninfl.*, because of their resemblance to the *p.* in needing the *prop.*, like اِنْ حَيْثُ, اِنْ اِنْ, and اِنْ اِنْ [115] (IA). Uninflectedness upon quiescence is the general rule (M, IA), because it is lighter than the vowel (IA): and deviation from it to the vowel is only for one of three causes, (1) to avoid [irregular (AAz)] concurrence of two quiescents [663], as in هُوَ لَا اِنْ; (2) not to begin with a quiescent, literally or predicamentally, as in the two ك s, that which is i. q. مَثَلُ [509], and that which is a *pron.*, [as in اَكْرَمَتَكَ, because it is in the predicament of detachment, as being an objective complement, without which the *v.* and *ag.* are complete (AAz)]; (3) [to indicate (AAz)] accidental uninflectedness, as in خَمْسَةَ عَشَرَ, مِنْ قَبْلُ, لَا رَجُلَ فِي الدَّارِ, يَا حَكَمَ [because, being *orig. infl.*, they are vocalized to distinguish between the permanently and accidentally *uninfl.* (AAz)]. The quiescence of uninflectedness is named

pause ; and its vowels Damm, Fath, and Kasr (M) Uninflectedness upon Kasr and Damm is found in the *n.* and *p.* [497] ; and uninflectedness upon Fath and quiescence in the *n.*, *v.* [402], and *p.* [497] (IA). The *uninfl. ns.* [except such as may be anomalous or have been previously mentioned (M)] comprise [7 *cats.* (M),] the *prons.*, the *dems.*, the conjuncts, the verbal *ns.* and *ejs.*, some of the *advs.*, the *comps.*, and the *mets.* (M, IH).

---



100% of the respondents were female, and 90% were aged 18 years or older.

§ 160. The pron., named by the KK met., is what indicates (1) a 1st pers., as أَنَا I and نَحْنُ We : (2) a 2nd pers., as أَنْتَ Thou and أَنْتُمَا Ye two : (3) a 3rd pers., as هُوَ He or It and هُمَا They two, (a) known, as سَمِعْتُ أَنَا أَنْتُمْ XCVII. 1. Verily We sent it down [133]: (b) prior, (a) unrestrictedly, as XXXVI. 39. [501]; (b) literally, but not in natural order, as وَأَنْ أَبْتَلِيَ إِبْرَاهِيمَ رَبَّهُ II. 118. And when his Lord tried Abraham; (c) in intention, as فَوَجَسَ فِي نَفْسِهِ خِيفَةً مُوسَى XX. 70. And Moses conceived fear in his mind: (e) posterior, unrestrictedly, in such as قُلْ هُوَ اللَّهُ أَحَدٌ CXII. 1. Say thou, It, i. e. The case [167], is this [27], God is one [609], XLV. 23. [539], نَعِمَ رَجُلًا زَيْدٌ Most excellent is he as a man, Zaid [469], رَبِّهِ رَجُلًا [168], قَامَا وَقَعْدَا أَخَوَاكَ [22], جَزَىٰ رَبُّهُ الْخَيْرَ [20]; but the soundest opinion is that this [last] is a poetic license. The pron. must have an exponent explaining what is meant by it. If it denote a 1st or 2nd pers., its exponent is the presence of the person that it belongs to. If it denote a 3rd pers., its exponent is (1) not an expression, as XCVII. 1., i. e. the Kur'ān, whose celebrity and independence of exposition are thus attested: (2) an expres-

sion, (a) mostly prior, (a) literally and constructively, as XXXVI. 39.; (b) literally, but not constructively, as II. 118.; (c) constructively, but not literally, as XX. 70.: because <sup>اِبْرَهِيْمُ</sup>, being an *obj.*, is meant to be understood as *postpos.*; and <sup>مُوسَى</sup>, being an *ag.*, is meant to be understood as *prepos.*: (b) sometimes posterior literally and in natural order (Sh). The positions where the *pron.* relates to an expression posterior literally and in natural order are 7, vid. where the *pron.* is (1) governed in the *nom.* by <sup>نَعَمْ</sup> or <sup>بَيْتُسُ</sup>, in which case it is expounded only by the *sp.*, as <sup>رَجُلًا</sup> <sup>زَيْدٌ</sup> <sup>نَعَمْ</sup> and <sup>رَجُلًا</sup> <sup>عَمْرُو</sup> <sup>بَيْتُسُ</sup>; while the <sup>فَعْلٌ</sup> that *praise* or *blame* is intended by [468] is coordinated with them, as VII. 176. [(475), *orig.* <sup>سَوَا</sup> (DM)], <sup>كَبِيرَتُ</sup> <sup>بَيْتُسُ</sup> XVIII. 4. *How great it is as a word that proceedeth!*, and <sup>رَجُلًا</sup> <sup>زَيْدٌ</sup> <sup>ظَرْفٌ</sup> *How clever he is as a man, Zaid!*: but, according to Fr and Ks, the particularized is the *ag.*, and there is no *pron.* in the *v.*, which is refuted by <sup>رَجُلًا</sup> <sup>زَيْدٌ</sup> <sup>كَانَ</sup> <sup>نَعَمْ</sup> *Such that most excellent was he as a man was Zaid!*, the annuller not being prefixed to the *ag.*, [but to the *inch.* (DM)]; and by the particularized's being sometimes suppressed [473], as <sup>بَيْتُسُ</sup> <sup>لِلظَّالِمِيْنِ</sup> <sup>بَدَلًا</sup> XVIII. 48. *Most evil is it, i. e. the substitute* [469], as a substitute for God, (*Iblis and his offspring*), [i. e. <sup>اِبْلِيسُ</sup> <sup>وَنَدَبَتُهُ</sup> (B), the *ag.* not being suppressed (DM)]: (2)

governed in the *nom.* by the 1st of 2 contending *ops.*  
the 2nd of which is made to govern, as

جَفَوْنِي وَلَمْ أَجِفِ الْإِخْلَاءَ إِنِّي  
لَغَيْرِ جَمِيلٍ مِنْ خَلِيلِي مُهْمَلٌ

[*They behaved unkindly to me, and I behaved not unkindly to the friends: verily I am indifferent to unkindness from my friends* (Jsh)] : (3) predicated of [by a single term

(DM)], in which case it is expounded by its *enunc.* or *pred.*, as <sup>أَنْ هِيَ</sup> <sup>الْأَحْيَاتِنَا</sup> <sup>الدُّنْيَا</sup> XXIII. 39. *It, i. e. Life, is not aught save our lower life, orig., says Z*

[followed by B], <sup>أَبْنِ</sup> <sup>الْحَيَوَةِ</sup> <sup>الْأَلْفِ</sup> : (4) the *pron.* of the case and fact, [which is the *pron.* predicated of by a *prop. expos.* of it (DM),] as CXII. 1. and <sup>فَإِذَا هِيَ</sup> <sup>شَاخِصَةٌ</sup> and XXI. 97. *Lo, it, i. e. the fact, will be this, staring will be the eyes of them that have disbelieved:*

(5) governed in the *gen.* by رَبِّ [505], in which case its predicament is the same as that of the *pron.* of نَعَمْ and بَشَى in that its exponent must be a *sp.*, and it itself must be *sing.*, as

رَبِّهِ فَتِيَّةٌ دُعوتُ إِلَى مَا \* يُورِثُ الْمَجْدَ دَائِبًا فَاجَابُوا

[*Many youths have I called to what entails glory perpetually, and they have answered!* (Jsh)] ; but it is always

masc., as ربة امرأة, not ربيها, whereas نَعِمْتُ امرأةً هنديةً [474] is said: (6) followed by an explicit *subst. exps.* of it, as ضربةً زيداً; and thus are explained اللهم الخ him, the pitiful, the merciful and قد أصبحت بقرقرى الخ him, the wretch [156], قاموا أخوتك, [21] قَامَا أخَوَاكَ, and قمرى نسوتك: (7) attached to a prior *ag.*, its exponent being a posterior *obj.*, as ضرب غلامه زيداً, allowed by Akh and IJ, whence كسا حمله الخ and ولو أن مجداً الخ [20]; but the majority hold that in prose the *obj.* in the case of that [*pron.* attached to the *ag.* and relating to the *obj.* (DM)] must be prior, as II. 118. (ML). When 2 or more possible exponents precede, the exponent is the nearest, as جأونى زيد وبكر فضربتك, i. e. *I beat Bakr*; but with [an explanatory] context may be the farthest, as جأونى عالم وجاهل فأكرمته (R). In وما سعد الخ [149] the *o. f.* is وما هى, the explicit *n* being then made to act as a *subst.* for the *pron.*, which is facilitated by their being in 2 opposite *props.*, [nominal and verbal,] and in 2 verses, [the 1st of which بانت الخ is in § 22.,] and separated by a *prop* [فقلبنى الخ]; and by the fact that repetition of the beloved's name is delighted in and inferior to it is the saying of AlḤuṭai'a

أَلَا حَبْنَا هِنْدَ وَأَرْضَ بِهَا هِنْدُ

*Now dearly loved are Hind and a land that Hind is in!*, because they are in one *prop.*, repetition of the explicit *n.* in one *prop.* being good only on the occasion of magnifying, as <sup>أَصْحَابُ الْيَمِينِ</sup> مَا أَصْحَابُ الْيَمِينِ LVI. 26. *And the companions of the right hand, what etc.* [29]; or aweing, as LXIX. 1. 2. [27] (BS). AlFird azZim-mānī says

مَشِينَا مَشَبَةَ اللَّيْثِ \* غَدَاً وَاللَّيْثُ غَضَبَانُ

*We stalked (towards them) with the stalk of the lion, when he has come forth early, the lion being wrathful (from hunger),* repeating اللَّيْثُ in the [same] verse, and not putting its *pron.*, for the sake of solemnity and awe; and they do that in the case of generic *ns.* and proper names, as says 'Adī Ibn Zaid

لَا أَرَى الْمَوْتَ يَسْبِقُ الْمَوْتَ شَيْءَ  
نَغَصَ الْمَوْتَ ذَا الْغَنَى وَالْفَقِيرَا

(T) *I see not death to be such that aught outstrips death: death has troubled the life of the wealthy and the poor* (Jsh). The *pron.* is (1) attached, [which is {inseparably (M)} attached (M, R) to its *op.* before it, being like a supplement to that *op.* and like some of its letters (R): and is (a) prominent, vid. what is expressed, like the ك in أَخُوكَ; (b) latent, vid. what is meant to be understood;

like that which is in <sup>زَيْدٌ</sup> ضَرَبَ (21) (M) : (2) detached (M, IH), which is like the explicit *n.* (M, R) in its independence (M), whether it be separated from its *op.*, as in <sup>أَلَا</sup> إِيَّاكَ ; or contiguous to it, as in <sup>أَنْتَ</sup> مَا أَنْتَ مِنْطَلِقًا (R).

§ 161. The *prons.* are [all (IA)] *uninfl.* (R, IA, Sh) upon quiescence, as <sup>قَوْمِي</sup> قَوْمًا , and <sup>قَوْمُوا</sup> قَوْمًا ; Fath, as <sup>قَمْتُ</sup> قَمْتُ ; Kasr, as <sup>قَمْتُ</sup> قَمْتُ ; and Damm, as <sup>قَمْتُ</sup> قَمْتُ (Sh): (1) from their resemblance to *ps.* (a) in constitution, like the <sup>ت</sup> in <sup>ضَرَبْتُ</sup> [159] and <sup>ك</sup> in <sup>ضَرَبَكَ</sup>, while the rest of the *prons.*, as <sup>أَنَا</sup> , <sup>أَنْتَ</sup> , <sup>نَحْنُ</sup> , and <sup>أَنْتُمَا</sup> , are similarly treated for the sake of uniformity ; or (b) in need of the exponent [160], as the *p.* needs an expression by means of which its sense may be intelligible [+97]: or (2) from lack of the motive for inflection in them, because the requirer of inflection in *ns.* is the concentration of various meanings upon one form, while the *prons.* are independent of inflection through the variation of their forms on account of the variation of meanings, since the *nom.*, *acc.*, and *gen.* have each a special *pron.* (R). Some of them, however, are common to (1) the *acc.* and *gen.*, vid. every attached *acc.* or *gen. pron.*, as <sup>أَكْرَمْتُكَ</sup> and <sup>مَرَرْتُ</sup> <sup>بِكَ</sup> , <sup>أَنْتَ</sup> and <sup>أَنْتَ</sup> : (2) the *nom.*, *acc.*, and *gen.*, vid. (a)

نَا , as نَانَا , نَانَا , and بَنَا ; (b) the ي , as اِضْرِبِي [402],  
 اِكْرَمِي [170], and مَرِي ; (c) هُم , as فَاثْمُون ,  
 اِكْرَمْنَهُم , and لَهُم : but نَا denotes the *nom.*, *acc.*, and *gen.*  
 while the meaning is one, and is an attached *pron.* in  
 the 3 cases ; whereas the ي , though used to denote the  
*nom.*, *acc.*, and *gen.*, and an attached *pron.* in the 3 cases,  
 is not of one meaning in the 3 cases, because in the *nom.*  
 it denotes the 2nd *pers.*, and in the *acc.* and *gen.* the 1st;  
 and هُم , though of one meaning in the 3 cases, is in the  
*nom.* a detached *pron.*, and in the *acc.* and *gen.* an at-  
 tached *pron.* (IA) The *pron.* is *nom.*, *acc.*, and *gen.*,  
 [because it occupies the place of the explicit *n.* (R, Jm)]:  
 the 2 first being [each (Jm)] attached and detached ;  
 and the 3rd only attached. [because the attached is like  
 the last part of its *op.* in that they are not separable (160),  
 while the *gen.* is so likewise (158), since separation of  
 the *pre.* and *post.*, though allowable in poetry (125),  
 being bad with the explicit *n.*, is not regarded in the  
 constitution of the *pron.* (R)]. The *pron.* is, therefore, of  
 5 sorts, (1) [the attached *nom.*, (like) the *pron.* of the  
*pret. act.* (Jm.)] ضَرَبْتُمْ , ضَرَبْنَا , ضَرَبْتُ , ضَرَبْتُمْ ,  
 ضَرَبْتُمْ (Jm.), ضَرَبْنَا , ضَرَبْتُ , ضَرَبْتُمْ , ضَرَبْتُمْ ,  
 to ضَرَبْتُمْ ; and [analogously of the *pass.* (Jm.)] ضَرَبْتُمْ to  
 ضَرَبْتُمْ : (2) [the detached *nom.* (Jm.),] اَنَا , اَنْتَ ,

<sup>ا٨٣</sup>اَنْتَ , <sup>ا٨٣</sup>اَنْتَما , <sup>ا٨٣</sup>اَنْتُمْ , <sup>ا٨٣</sup>اَنْتِى , <sup>ا٨٣</sup>هُوَ , <sup>ا٨٣</sup>هِيَ , <sup>ا٨٣</sup>هُمَا , <sup>ا٨٣</sup>هُنَّ (Jm),] to  
<sup>ا٨٣</sup>هِنَّ : (3) [the attached *acc.*, which is attached to the *v*, as  
 (Jm)] <sup>ا٨٣</sup>ضَرَبْتَنِي , [ <sup>ا٨٣</sup>ضَرَبْتَا , <sup>ا٨٣</sup>ضَرَبْتَكَ , <sup>ا٨٣</sup>ضَرَبْتِى , <sup>ا٨٣</sup>ضَرَبْتُمَا , <sup>ا٨٣</sup>ضَرَبْتُمْ ,  
<sup>ا٨٣</sup>ضَرَبْتِهِنَّ (Jm),] to <sup>ا٨٣</sup>ضَرَبْتَهُنَّ ;  
 and [to something else, as (Jm)] <sup>ا٨٣</sup>اَنْكَ , <sup>ا٨٣</sup>اَنْتَا , <sup>ا٨٣</sup>اَنْتِى ,  
 (4) : <sup>ا٨٣</sup>اَنْهِنَّ (Jm), etc.,] to <sup>ا٨٣</sup>اَنْهِنَّ : (4)  
 [the detached *acc.* (Jm)] <sup>ا٨٣</sup>اِيَاكَ , <sup>ا٨٣</sup>اِيَانَا , <sup>ا٨٣</sup>اِيَاىَ ,  
<sup>ا٨٣</sup>اِيَاكُمْ , <sup>ا٨٣</sup>اِيَاكُنَّ , <sup>ا٨٣</sup>اِيَاكُم , <sup>ا٨٣</sup>اِيَاكُنَّ (Jm), etc.,] to <sup>ا٨٣</sup>اِيَاهُنَّ : (5) [the attached  
*gen.*, which is attached to the *n.*, as (Jm)] <sup>ا٨٣</sup>غُلَامِنَا , <sup>ا٨٣</sup>غُلَامِي ,  
<sup>ا٨٣</sup>غُلَامِكُمْ , <sup>ا٨٣</sup>غُلَامِكُنَّ (Jm), etc.,] to <sup>ا٨٣</sup>غُلَامِهِنَّ ; and [to the *p.*, as (Jm)]  
<sup>ا٨٣</sup>لِي , <sup>ا٨٣</sup>لَكَ , <sup>ا٨٣</sup>لَنَا (Jm), etc.,] to <sup>ا٨٣</sup>لِهِنَّ (IH). Each of these 5  
 sorts denotes 18 meanings, because each of them denotes  
 a 1st, 2nd, or 3rd *pers.*; and these 3, being each *sing.*,  
*du.*, or *pl.*, become 9 ; and each of the 9 is *masc.* or *fem.*:  
 so that 6 [meanings] belong to the 1st *pers.*, 6 to the 2nd,  
 and 6 to the 3rd (R); and by analogy the *prons.* of each  
*pers.* should be 6 in number (Jm). But the Arabs con-  
 stitute (1) for the 1st *pers.* 2 expressions, that indicate  
 [the (R)] 6 meanings [mentioned (R)], as <sup>ا٨٣</sup>ضَرَبْتُ and  
<sup>ا٨٣</sup>ضَرَبْنَا , [the *pron.* of (Jm)] <sup>ا٨٣</sup>ضَرَبْتُ being common to  
 the *sing. masc.* and *fem.*, and [the *pron.* of (Jm)]  
<sup>ا٨٣</sup>ضَرَبْنَا to the *du.* and *pl., masc.* and *fem.*: [(a) they make



the 1st *pers.*, *sing.* or otherwise, common to the *masc.* and *fem.*, because of the rarity of ambiguity in the 1st *pers.*: (b) they coin a form, vid. <sup>أَنتَ</sup>, as likewise is the case with <sup>نَحْنُ</sup>, for the *du.* and *pl.* of the 1st *pers.*, and do not add an <sup>أَ</sup> for the *du.* and <sup>و</sup> for the *pl.*, as they do in the *du.* and *pl.* of the 2nd and 3rd *pers.*, because, when told to distribute <sup>أَنْتُمْ</sup> and <sup>أَنْتَ</sup>, you say <sup>أَنْتَ يَا زَيْدَ وَأَنْتَ يَا عَمْرُو</sup> and <sup>أَنْتَ يَا زَيْدَ وَأَنْتَ يَا عَمْرُو</sup>, whereas, when told to distribute <sup>نَحْنُ</sup>, you say, when you mean the *du.*, <sup>أَنَا وَزَيْدَ</sup> or <sup>أَنَا</sup> <sup>وَأَنْتَ</sup> or <sup>أَنَا وَهوَ وَأَنْتَ</sup>, and, when you mean the *pl.*, <sup>أَنَا وَزَيْدَ</sup> <sup>وَأَنْتَ</sup>, each of its individuals not being <sup>أَنَا</sup>; so that, since the condition of the *du.* and *pl.*, vid. agreement of the 2 or more *ns.* in letter is not realized (in the 1st *pers.*), the constituents of its *du.* and *pl.* do not agree with those of the other *dus.* and *pls.*; and therefore they coin a form for the *du.*, and make it common to the *pl.* because of the security from ambiguity owing to the sight (of the persons meant): (c) the great man sometimes says <sup>نَحْنُ</sup>, <sup>فَعَلْنَا</sup>, and <sup>أَيَّانَا</sup>, reckoning himself to be like a multitude (R)]: (2) for the 2nd *pers.* 5 expressions, 4 proper, [vid. <sup>ضَرَبْتَ</sup>, <sup>ضَرَبْتُمْ</sup>, <sup>ضَرَبْتَنِي</sup>, and <sup>ضَرَبْتَنِي</sup> (R)]; and 1 common to the *du.* *masc.* and *fem.*, [vid. <sup>ضَرَبْتُمَا</sup> (R)]: (3) for the 3rd *pers.*

the same assortment as for the 2nd, [as ضَرَبْتُ , ضَرَبَ , ضَرَبُوا , ضَرَبْتُمْ , ضَرَبْنَا , ضَرَبْتُمْ (R),] the *pron.* [in ضَرَبْنَا and ضَرَبْتُمْ (Jm)] being the 1 common to the 2 *du.*; [whereas the 2 *prons.* supplied in ضَرَبَ and ضَرَبْتُمْ must be different one from the other, like the detached *prons.* هُوَ and هِيَ (R)]. The rest of the 5 sorts follow this course, i. e. the 1st *pers.* has 2 expressions, the 2nd 5, and the 3rd 5, the total being 12 words denoting 18 meanings (R, Jm); so that the aggregate of the 5 sorts is 60 words denoting 90 meanings (Jm). The ت made mobile in the endings of *vs.* is a *pron.*, as قُمْتُ , قُمْتُ , and قُمْتُ (ML). They pronounce the ت (1) of the 1st *pers. sing.* with Damma, because of the affinity of Damma to the vowel of the *ag.*: (2) of the 2nd *pers. sing.* (a) in the *masc.* with Fath, for distinction between it and the 1st *pers. sing.* and for alleviation; (b) in the *fem.* with Kasr. They add م before the 1 of the *du.* in تُمَا and , of the *pl. [masc.]* in تُمُو , in order that the *du.* may not be confounded with the 2nd *pers. sing. masc.* when its Fathā is impleted because of unbinding, nor the *pl.* with the 1st *pers. sing.* whose Damma is impleted: the م being the letter most suitable for addition, because the unsound letters are deemed heavy before the 1 and , while the م is the nearest of the sound letters to the unsound ones, because it is nasal and labial like the , for which reason what

precedes it is pronounced with Damm, like what precedes the و . Elision of the و of the *pl.* with quiescence of the م , if not immediately followed by a *pron.*, is commoner than retention of the و preceded by Damm, because the و at the end preceded by Damm is deemed heavy [721]; whereas, if the م of the *pl.* be followed immediately by a *pron.*, as ضربتموه , the Damm and و must be restored, because, the [subsequent] *pron.* being through its attachment like one of the letters of the word, the و as it were does not occur at the end. The م of the *pl.*, when met by a quiescent after it, is pronounced with Damm, because it is restored to its *o. f.*; but Kasr of it is allowed, as will be shown [in the 2nd ضربتم below]. A ن doubled to correspond with the م and و in the *masc.* is added for the [*pl.*] *fem.*, the ن being chosen from its resemblance, as being nasal, to the م and و together, while all 3 are letters of augmentation [671] (R). A strange fact about the ت is that it is divested of *allocution*, [the *allocution* understood from the ك being held sufficient (DM),] and is invariably *sing. masc.*, [even though the party addressed by the expression containing it be *du. masc.* or *fem.*, *pl. masc.*, *sing. fem.*, or *pl. fem.*, as (DM)] in ارايتكما , ارايتكنم , ارايتكن , ارايتكني , and ارايتكني , since, if they said ارايتكما , they would combine 2 *allocutions* [in one sentence (DM)]; whereas, when they abstain from combining them in يا غلامكم , so that they do not say it, as they say يا غلامنا

and <sup>٨٥ ١١ ٥</sup>يَا غُلَامَهُمْ, notwithstanding that in the <sup>٨٥ ١١ ٥</sup>غُلَام the allocation is adventitious because of the vocation, [not original (DM),] and that <sup>٨٥ ١١ ٥</sup>يَا غُلَامَكُم is an address to two [different parties], not to one, this is more fit [to be disallowed, because the allocution in it is original, not adventitious, and the party addressed by it is one, not two (DM)], while <sup>٨٥ ١١ ٥</sup>يَا غُلَامَكِيَّة [55] is allowable only because the lamented is not really addressed (ML), but merely grieved over (DM). The [attached *nom.*] *pron.* of the 3rd *pers. sing. masc. and fem.* is latent [165], because, since the exponent of the 3rd *pers.* is *orig. a prior* expression, contrary to those of the 2nd and 3rd *pers.*, they mean the *prons.* of the 3rd *pers.* to be shorter than those of the 2 others : so that they begin in the 2 *sings.* with the extreme of abbreviation, *vid.* supplying without expressing anything ; and restrict themselves in the *du. masc. and fem.* to the ا, which is the sign of dualization in every *du.*; and in the *pl. masc.* to the و, which is sometimes dispensed with by the aid of the Damma in poetic license, as

وَلَوْ أَنَّ الْأَطِبَّاءَ كَانُوا حَوْلِي \* وَكَانَ مَعَ الْأَطِبَّاءِ الْأَسَاءَةُ

[And, if it were the case that the physicians were around me, and the surgeons were with the physicians, *orig.* كَانُوا (Jsh)], because the و preceded by Damm is deemed heavy at the end ; and [in the *pl. fem.*] to a single ن corresponding with the و, since it is single. The ت

in ضَرَبَتْ and ضَرَبَتْ is a *p.* denoting femininization [607], not a *pron.*, as is proved by ضَرَبَتْ هَنْدٌ (R). The ا, و, and ن are attached *nom. prons.*, denoting the 3rd *pers.*, as قَامَا الزَّيْدَانِ [20], and اَلْهِنْدَاتُ قَمْنِ ; and the 2nd, as اَعْلَمُوا, and اَعْلَمْنِ ; but not the 1st (IA). The و is sometimes used for irrational objects, when treated like rational beings, as يَا أَيُّهَا النَّمْلُ ادْخُلُوا مَسَاكِنَكُمْ XXVIII, 18. *O ye ants, enter etc.* [611], because the allocution is addressed to them, [allocution being addressed only to rational beings (DM)]; but the saying [of AnNābigħa alJa'dī (Jsh)]

شَرَبْتُ بِهَا وَالَّذِيكَ يَدْعُو صَبَاحَهُ  
إِذَا مَا بَنُو نَعَشٍ دَنَوْا فَتَضَوُّوْا

[*Did I drink of* (the *pron.* in بِهَا relating to the صُهَبَاءُ mentioned in the preceding verse وَصُهَبَاءُ الْخ And many a red wine etc.), *while the cock was crowing in his morning, when the stars in the tail of Ursa Minor had drawn near to the west and set* ! (Jsh)] is anomalous, [because allocution is not found in it (DM),] what emboldens him to that being his saying بَنُو, not بَنَات (ML). The ا, و, and ن are seldom *ps.* [21, 497], like the ت of femininization (R). The ي is a *pron.* denoting the [2nd *pers.*]

*sing. fem.* [402], as <sup>تَقْوَمِينَ</sup> and <sup>قَوْمِي</sup> (ML). In the *aor.* the [attached *nom.*] *pron* is not made prominent in <sup>أَفْعَل</sup> and <sup>نَفْعَل</sup> [165], because the two aoristic letters [404] notify the *ag.*, since <sup>أَفْعَل</sup> notifies that its *ag.* is <sup>أَنَا</sup>, and <sup>نَفْعَل</sup> that its *ag.* is <sup>نَحْنُ</sup>; and similarly, <sup>يَفْعَل</sup> being proper to the 3rd *pers. sing. masc.*, they do not need a prominent *pron.* for it; and, though <sup>تَفْعَل</sup> is common to the 2nd *pers. sing. masc.* and 3rd *pers. sing. fem.*, still they do not make its *pron.* prominent, in order to treat the *sings.* of the *aor.* uniformly; and perhaps this is what induces Akh to say that the <sup>ي</sup> in <sup>تَضَرَّبِينَ</sup> is not a *pron.*, but a *p.* of feminization, and the *pron.* necessarily latent: while the predicament of the *imp.* <sup>أَفْعَلْ</sup> and *prohib.* <sup>لَا تَفْعَلْ</sup> is that of <sup>تَفْعَلْ</sup> for the 2nd *pers. sing. masc.*, because the *imp.* and *prohib.* are derived from the *aor.* [428, 419, 603]. The [attached] *nom. prons.* are not made prominent in the *eps.*, i. e. *act.* and *pass. parts.* and assimilate *ep.*, because, their requirement of the *ag.* not being radical, but due to resemblance to the *v.*, the *pron.* of the *ag.* does not appear in them, as likewise is the case with the verbal *ns.* and *advs.* [163, 165, 187]; and also because, the <sup>ا</sup> and <sup>و</sup> in the *du.* and *pls.* of *prim.* substantives, like <sup>الزَّيْدَانِ</sup> and <sup>الزَّيْدُونَ</sup>, being undoubtedly letters added as a sign of the *du.* and *pl.*,

and the *du.* and *pls.* of *eps.* being modelled upon the *du.* and *pls.* of *prims.*, the *ʾ* becomes a sign of the *du.*, and the *و* of the *pl.*, so that it is impossible for the *ʾ* and *و* of the *pron.* to be conjoined with the *du.* and *pl.*, lest two *ʾ*s and two *و*s be combined, and therefore the 2 *prons.* become covert, the *ʾ* in the *du.* and the *و* in the *pl.*, the proof that the expressed *ʾ* and *و* are not *prons.* being their convertibility [into *ي*] by the *ops.*, as ضَارِبِيْنَ and لَقِيْتُ ضَارِبِيْ, whereas the *ag.* is not altered by the *ops.* prefixed to its *op.*; while the *ي* likewise becomes covert in ضَارِبَاتٌ and مُضَرَّوْبَاتٌ in imitation of the *pron.* in the *pl. masc.*, since it is the *o. f.*; and, since the *pron.* is latent in the *du.* and *pl.*, it is *a fortiori* latent in their *sings.*; so that it is invariably latent in all [numbers and genders] (R). The detached *nom.* is (1) 1st *pers.*, (a) *sing.* اَنَا; (b) associated with or magnifying himself نَحْنُ: (2) 2nd *pers.*, (a) *sing., masc.* أَنْتَ and *fem.* أَنْتِ; (b) *du., masc. or fem.* أَنْتُمَا; (c) *pl., masc.* أَنْتُمْ and *fem.* أَنْتُنَّ: (3) 3rd *pers.*, (a) *sing., masc.* هُوَ and *fem.* هِيَ; (b) *du., masc. or fem.* هُمَا; (c) *pl., masc.* هُمْ and *fem.* هُنَّ (IA). According to the BB, اُ is a Hamza and ي pronounced with Fath; and the *ʾ* is put after the *ي* in pause to make the Fathā plain, because, if it were not for the *ʾ*, the Fathā would drop off on account of the pause, so that it might be con-

founded with the *p.* <sup>ا</sup>أ<sup>هـ</sup> ; and therefore it is written with the ا, because orthography is based upon [the forms of] pause and inception : but sometimes its <sup>ي</sup>ي is paused upon quiescent, or its Fatha is made |lain in pause by the ∂ of silence [615]; and the ا is retained in continuity also by the Banu Tamim as matter of choice, but by others only as a poetic license, as

أَنَا سَيْفُ الْعَشِيرَةِ فَأَعْرِفُونِي \* حَمِيدًا قَدْ تَذَرَيْتَ السَّنَامَا

[*I am the sword of the paternal kinsfolk; wherefore know ye me praiseworthy, having mounted upon the summit (Jsh)*]. The KK, however, hold that the ا after the <sup>ي</sup>ي is part of the word itself ; but its mostly dropping off [in pronunciation] in continuity, with Fath and sometimes quiescence of the <sup>ي</sup>ي, and the alternation of the ∂ of silence with it in pause are proofs that it is *aug.* and intended to make the vowel plain in pause. [The final of] <sup>ي</sup>نَحْنِ is vocalized because of the 2 quiescents ; and is pronounced with Damm, either because <sup>ي</sup>نَحْنِ is a *nom. pron.*, or because it denotes the *pl.*, whose property is the و. The *pron.* in <sup>ا</sup>أَنْتِ to <sup>ا</sup>أَنْتِ, according to the BB, is <sup>ا</sup>أَنْتِ, its *o. f.* being <sup>ا</sup>أَنَا, which, according to them, is a *pron.* applicable to all the 2nd *perss.* and to the 1st *pers. sing.*; so that they begin with the 1st *pers.*, and, though by analogy they ought to distinguish it by the <sup>ا</sup>أَنْتِ pronounced with Damm, as <sup>ا</sup>أَنْتِ, still, since the 1st *pers.* is original, they make omission of the sign a



sign of it, and distinguish the 2nd *pers.* by a *p.* ت [560] after <sup>ا٤</sup>ان, like the *n.* [ت] in letter and plasticity. But Fr holds that <sup>ا٤</sup>انت in its entirety is a *n.*, the ت being part of the word itself: while some say that the *nom. pron.* is the plastic ت that is an attached *nom.*, and that, when they mean it to be detached, they support it with <sup>ا٤</sup>ان in order that it may be independent, as some of the KK and IK hold that the plastic ك in اياك is [an] attached [acc.], and that, when they mean it to be literally independent, in order that it may become detached, they make <sup>ا٤</sup>ايا a support for it, so that the *pron.* is what follows <sup>ا٤</sup>ايا [162]; and I think this saying to be not far from right in both cases. The و and ي in هو and هي are, according to the BB, an original part of the word; and, according to the KK, an impletion, the *pron.* being the ه alone, on the evidence of the *du.* and *pl.*, where you elide them: but the 1st is right, because the letter of impletion is not vocalized, nor even authorized except as a poetic license. The و and ي are vocalized in order that the word, becoming independent by means of the Fatha, may be fit to be a detached *pron.*, since, if it were not for the vowel, they would be as it were impletions, as the KK think; for, when you mean the word not to be independent, you make the و and ي quiescent, as <sup>ا٤</sup>انه and <sup>ا٤</sup>انهي [converted, as will be shown,

into <sup>ت</sup>انها ]: but the <sup>و</sup> and <sup>ي</sup> are sometimes elided by poetic license, as [ <sup>ء</sup>واكفية <sup>ء</sup>الغ (501),]

فَمَيْدَنَا يَشْرِي رَحْلَةً قَالَ قَائِلٌ \* لِمَنِ جَمَلٌ رِخْوُ الْعِلَاطِ نَجِيبٌ

*Then, while he was selling his camel-saddle, a sayer said,  
Who has a he-camel soft in the side of the hump, well-  
bred?*, and <sup>ء</sup>دَارُ <sup>ء</sup>الغ [333]; and are made quiescent by

Kais and Asad; and doubled by Hamdān, as <sup>ء</sup>وَأَنَّ <sup>ء</sup>لِسَانِي [498]. The *du.* and *pl.* are lightened by elision of

the <sup>و</sup> and <sup>ي</sup>; and the addition of the <sup>م</sup> [in the *du.* and *pl. masc.*], the elision of the <sup>و</sup> in the *pl. masc.*, and the addition of the two <sup>ن</sup>s in the *pl. fem.*, are exactly according to what we mentioned in the attached [*nom.*].

These detached *nom. prons.* are common to the *pret.*, *aor.*, *imp.*, and *eps.*; and are not like the attached *noms*, none of which are common to the *pret.* and *aor.*, except

the <sup>أ</sup>, <sup>و</sup>, and <sup>ن</sup>: you say <sup>ء</sup>هُوَ <sup>ء</sup>مَا ضَرَبَ <sup>ء</sup>أَلَا <sup>ء</sup>يَضْرِبُ <sup>ء</sup>مَا <sup>ء</sup>يَضْرِبُ. They constitute for the 1st

*pers. sing.* of the attached *acc.* and *gen.* a <sup>ي</sup> either quiescent or pronounced with Fath [129]; and for the 1st *pers.* with others <sup>أ</sup>, as in the attached *nom.*: and

for the 2nd *pers.* the <sup>ك</sup>, like the <sup>ت</sup> in plasticity, as <sup>ء</sup>كُفَى, <sup>ء</sup>كُفَى, <sup>ء</sup>كُفَى, and <sup>ء</sup>كُفَى, while the elision of the <sup>و</sup> from [the *pl. masc.*, as] <sup>ء</sup>عليكمو, and the quiescence of

the م are as we described in ضَرَبْتُمْ : and they abridge the two *sings.* of the 3rd *pers.* from the detached *nom.*, eliding the vowel of the و and ی from هُوَ and هِیَ, and converting the ی of هِیَ into ا, so that it becomes هَا ; because, the *pron.* of the *masc.*, when it immediately follows Kasr, having its و converted into ی, as یَی, they fear confusion of the *fem.* with the *masc.* The vowel of the ڤ in the *sing. masc.* is Damma, unless it be preceded by a [quiescent] ی or a Kasra : and, if it be preceded by either of them, the people of AlHijāz preserve its Damma, saying لَدِیْهِمُ and یَیْهِمُ ; but others pronounce it with Kasr, because the ڤ, being a light letter, is not an impassable barrier, so that the quiescent و as it were immediately follows the Kasra or ی, and is therefore converted into ی, while the ڤ is pronounced with Kasr on account of the ی after it : whereas, if the quiescent be any other than the ی, Damm of the ڤ is agreed upon, except that, as F transmits, a people of Bakr Ibn Wā'il pronounce it with Kasr in the *sing. masc.*, *du.*, and two *pls.*, as مِنْهُ, مِنْهُمَا, مِنْهُمْ, and مِنْهِنَّ [below]. If the ڤ of the *sing. masc.* immediately follow a mobile, its vowel is impleted, as لَهْوُ, ضَرَبَهْوُ, غَلَامَهْوُ, and یَیْهِ, a و being engendered from the Damm, and a

ي from the Kasr: though the Banu 'Ukail and Kilāb allow elision of the *conj.*, i. e. the و and ي, after the mobile as matter of choice, with retention of the Damma or Kasra of the ڤ, as غلامه and ڤي, and also with quiescence of the ڤ; while others allow both, i. e. slurring and elision of the vowel, as a poetic license, not as matter of choice. But, if the ڤ of the *sing. masc.* immediately follow a quiescent, whether a soft letter, as in عليه, or any other, as in منه, the vowel is preferably slurred, i. e. the *conj.* is omitted, because, the ڤ being a faint letter, [if the *conj.* were put,] 2 quiescents would as it were meet together; while Ibn Kathīr conjoins unrestrictedly, as عليه, منه, and the like. Thus in the ڤ of the *sing. masc.* after the Kasra or [quiescent] ي there are with respect to its Damm, Kasr, slurring, and conjunction 4 *dials.*, Kasr being the commonest, (1) Kasr of the ڤ, (a) not conjoined with a ي, [as ڤي and عليه,] which is more frequent after the ي than after the Kasra, because in the 1st case [if the ڤ were conjoined with a ي] there would be a quasi-concurrence of 2 quiescents; (b) conjoined with a ي, as يهي and عليهي, which is commoner after the Kasra than after the ي, because of what we have just mentioned:

(2) Damm of the  $\delta$ , (a) with the  $\omega$ , as <sup>س</sup>بِهِ and <sup>س</sup>عَلَيْهِ ;  
 (b) without a  $\omega$ , as <sup>س</sup>بِ and <sup>س</sup>عَلَيْهِ : while after the Kasra  
 there is a 5th *dial.*, vid. making the Kasr of the  $\delta$  to  
 smack somewhat of Damma without conjunction. And,  
 if a soft letter be elided before the  $\delta$  of the *sing. masc.*,  
 because of apocopation, as in <sup>س</sup>يَرْضَهُ XXXIX. 9. *He will*  
*approve it* and <sup>س</sup>نُصَلِّهِ IV. 115. *And We will burn him*,  
 or pause [431], as in <sup>س</sup>فَالِقَهُ XXVII. 28. *And cast thou it*,  
 the vowel of the  $\delta$  may be impleted from regard to the  
 mobile literally before it, or slurred from regard to the  
 quiescent accidentally elided before it ; or the  $\delta$  may be  
 made quiescent by treating continuity like pause : with  
 all of which pronunciations the *Kur'ān* is read. The  $\delta$   
 in the *du.* and 2 *pls.*, (1) if preceded by a Fatha or  
 Damma, is pronounced with Damm, as <sup>س</sup>لَهُمَا and <sup>س</sup>غَلَامَهُمَا :  
 (2) if preceded by an  $\text{f}$ ,  $\omega$ , or sound quiescent, is like-  
 wise so pronounced ; except in what F transmits [above],  
 such, as <sup>س</sup>مِنْهُمْ, <sup>س</sup>مَتَهُمْ, <sup>س</sup>أَضْرِبُهُمَا, and <sup>س</sup>أَضْرِبَهُمْ, because of  
 the alliteration, and because the barrier is reckoned to  
 be not impassable on account of its quiescence : (3) if  
 preceded by a Kasra or [quiescent]  $\text{y}$ , is pronounced  
 (a) with Damm by those who say in the *sing.* <sup>س</sup>بِهِ and  
<sup>س</sup>عَلَيْهِ, vid. the people of AlHijāz, as <sup>س</sup>بِغَلَامِهِمَا and <sup>س</sup>بِغَلَامِهِمْ

غَلَامِيَهُنَّ and غَلَامِيَهُمْ and اِنَّ غَلَامِيَهُمَا and بِغَلَامِيَهُنَّ.  
 while Hamza makes Damm in the *pl. masc.* peculiar  
 to 3 words, عَلَيْهِمْ, اَلَيْهِمْ, and لَدَيْهِمْ, because, as is  
 said, the ي in them, being a *subst.* for the ا, is given  
 the predicament of its *o. f.*; but, according to this reason-  
 ing, he ought to read in the *sing. masc.*, *du.*, and *pl. fem.*  
 عَلَيْهِ, عَلَيْهِمَا, and عَلَيْهِنَّ, whereas he does not do so:  
 (b) with Kasr unrestrictedly by others than the people  
 of AlHijāz, as in the *sing. masc.*, which is commoner.  
 The م of the *pl.* after the ه pronounced with Kasr, (1)  
 if paused upon, must be made quiescent after elision of  
 its *conj.*: (2) if not paused upon, then, (a) if followed by  
 a quiescent, is more agreeably with analogy pronounced  
 with Kasr, because of the alliteration to the Kasr of  
 the ه and because of the concurrence of 2 quiescents  
 [664], as مِنْ دُونِهِمْ امْرَاتَيْنِ XXVIII. 23. *Below them*  
*two women* and عَلَيْهِمُ الذَّلَّةُ II. 58. [*And*] *abjectness*  
*[and poverty were made to cleave] to them*, according to  
 the reading of Abū 'Amr; while the rest of the Readers  
 pronounce the م with Damm from regard to the *o. f.*:  
 (b) if followed by a mobile, is most commonly made  
 quiescent, as I. 6. 7. [498]; while some implete the  
 Damm of the م, as عَلَيْهِمُ غَيْرُ الْمَغْضُوبِ عَلَيْهِمْ, like  
 the reading of Ibn Kathīr; and impletion of the Kasr is  
 more agreeable with analogy, because of the alliteration.

Thus the  $\text{م}$  after the  $\text{ذ}$  pronounced with Kasr has 5 states, 2 before the quiescent, vid. Kasr and Damm, each with slurring, i. e. omission of the *conj.*; and 3 before the mobile, vid. quiescence, impletion of Damm, and impletion of Kasr. And the  $\text{م}$  after the  $\text{ذ}$  pronounced with Damm in accordance with the practice of the people of AlHijāz in <sup>٨٥</sup>بهم and <sup>٨٥ ٨٨</sup>عليهم, and with common consent in such as <sup>٨٥</sup>أهم, <sup>٨٥ ٥ ٥</sup>غلامهم, and <sup>٨٥</sup>قفاهم, and with the commonest usage in <sup>٨٥ ٨</sup>منهم—as likewise [the *pl.*] in <sup>٨٥ ٨٥</sup>انتم, <sup>٨٥ ٨٨</sup>ضربتم [above], and <sup>٨٥ ٥ ٥</sup>غلامكم—has also 5 states, 2 before the quiescent, vid. Damm, which is more agreeable with analogy and commoner, because of the alliteration and from regard for the *o. f.*; and Kasr, from regard to the 2 quiescents, which is extremely rare, and is disallowed by F : and 3 before the mobile, vid. quiescence, which is the commonest; Damm and conjunction with a و; and Kasr and conjunction with a ي, which is peculiar to the  $\text{م}$  whose  $\text{ذ}$  is preceded by a Kasra or [quiescent] ي, as <sup>٥ ٨٨</sup>بهمي and <sup>٥ ٨٨</sup>عليهمي, the  $\text{م}$  being pronounced with Kasr for homogeneity with the Kasra or ي before the  $\text{ذ}$ , and the و converted into ي on account of the Kasra of the  $\text{م}$ , which also is disallowed by F (R). The detached *acc.*

is (1) 1st *pers.*, (a) *sing.* أَيَّيْ ; (b) associated with or magnifying himself أَيَّنَا : (2) 2nd *pers.*, (a) *sing.*, *masc.* أَيَّاكَ and *fem.* أَيَّاكِ ; (b) *du.*, *masc.* or *fem.* أَيَّكُمَا ; (c) *pl.*, *masc.* أَيَّاكُمْ and *fem.* أَيَّاكُنَّ : (3) 3rd *pers.*, (a) *sing.*, *masc.* أَيَّاهُ and *fem.* أَيَّاها ; (b) *du.*, *masc.* or *fem.* أَيَّاهُمَا ; (c) *pl.*, *masc.* أَيَّاهُمْ and *fem.* أَيَّاهُنَّ (IA).

To constitute the detached *acc.* they put أَيَّا followed by the form of the *pron.* of the attached *acc.* [162]. They make the *pron.* of the *gen.* accord with that of the *acc.*, because the *gen.* is [also] an *obj.*, but through a medium; and make it accord with the expression of the attached *acc.*, because the *gen.* must be attached: so that the *pron.* of the *gen.* is exactly like that of the attached *acc.*

(R). The ي, ك, and ه, when attached to the *v.* are *objs.*; and, when attached to the *n.*, are *post.* From the 1st [rule], however, are excepted such [phrases] as اَرَايْتَكَ زَيْدًا مَا صَنَعَ [560]: and from the 2nd two sorts, (1) one where these expressions have no [inflectional] place, as in تِلْكَ and ذَلِك [172], and أَيَّيْ [162], أَيَّاكَ, and أَيَّاهُ : (2) one where they are in the place of an *acc.*, as in (a) الضَّارِبُكَ and الضَّارِبَةُ [113], according to S; (b) their saying لَا عَهْدَ لِي بِالْأَمِّ قَفًّا مِنْهُ وَلَا أَرْضَعُهُ [162], *I have no knowledge of a baser fellow as to back of the*



head than him, nor of a viler as to it with Fath of the ع, the 8 being in the position of an *acc.*, like the 8 in الضاربة, except that the latter [ 8 (DM)] is an *obj.*, and the former assimilated to the *obj.*, because the *n.* of superiority does not govern the *obj.* in the *acc.*, and not being *post.*, otherwise اوضع would be put into the *gen.* with Kasra [17]; (c) the saying [of AlAhwas (Jsh)]

لَئِنْ كَانَ النِّكَاحُ أَحَلَّ شَيْئًا \* فَإِنَّ نِكَاحَهَا مَطَرٌ حَرَامٌ

[Assuredly, if wedlock be such that it makes lawful a thing unlawful, verily Matar's wedding her is unlawful (Jsh)], in the version with مَطَرٌ in the *gen.*, the *pron.* being in the *acc.* as an *obj.*, and separating the *pre.* [*inf.* *n.* (DM)] and *post.* [*ag.* (DM)]. The ك in رويدك زيدا Deal gently with Zaid [187, 188, 560], if you construe رويد to be a verbal *n.*, [i. q. امهل (DM),] is a *p.* of allocution, [زيدا being an *obj.*, and the *ag.* a latent *pron.* (DM)]; but, if you construe it to be an *inf. n.*, [i. q. ارداك and امهل, governed in the *acc.* by a suppressed *v.*, i. e. اردك (DM),] is a *post. n.*, [the *inf. n.* being *pre.* to its *ag.* (DM),] whose place is the *nom.*, because it is an *ag.* (ML). In XXIII. 101. [598] God is addressed with the *pl.* for magnification, like

فَإِنْ شِئْتَ حَرَمْتُ النِّسَاءَ سِوَاكُمْ  
وَإِنْ شِئْتَ لَمْ أَطْعَمْ نَفْلًا وَلَا بَرًّا

[by Al'Arjī, *And, if thou wish, I will forbid myself women, except you; and, if thou wish, I will not taste sweet cool water nor sleep, a single woman being sometimes addressed with the pl. masc., as a man says of his wife فَعَلُوا كَذَا* from taking such extraordinary pains to conceal her that he does not even utter the *pron.* applicable to her, whence لَاهِلُهُ أَكْثَرُوا XX. 9. *And said to his wife, Bide ye here (N),*] and

أَلَا فَارْحَمُونِي يَا إِلَهَ مُحَمَّدٍ \* فَإِنْ لَمْ أَكُنْ أَهْلًا فَانْتَ لَهُ أَهْلٌ

(K) *Now, then, have Ye mercy upon me, O God of Muḥammad: for, if I be not worthy of mercy, Thou art worthy of having it (Jsh), it being a way of the Arabs to say to a great man and august sovereign انظروا فِي* *Look ye into mine affair, because lords and kings say نَحْنُ فَعَلْنَا and أَنَا أَمَرْنَا (N).* 'Akīl Ibn 'Ullafa alMurri says

وَكُنتُ بِسَائِلِ جَارَاتِ بَيْتِي \* أَغْيَابُ رِجَالِكِ أَمْ شُهُودُ

*And I am not one to ask the female neighbours of my tent, Are your husbands absent or present?, orig. رِجَالِكُنْ ; but*

this is allowable in poetry only (T). In <sup>وَاتُوا النِّسَاءَ</sup> *IV. 3. And give ye the women*  
*their dowries freely ; but, if etc. [85] the pron. in* <sup>مِنْهُ</sup> *is treated like the dem., as though* <sup>مِنْ ذَلِكَ</sup> *were said,*  
*like* <sup>قُلْ أَرُونِيْكُمْ بِخَيْرٍ مِنْ ذَٰلِكُمْ</sup> *III. 13. Say thou, Shall I*  
*tell you of a better than that?* after the mention of the  
<sup>شَهَوَاتِ</sup> *lusts, one of the proofs heard from the mouths of*  
*the Arabs being that Ru'ba [Ibn Al'Ajjāz (Jsh)] is relat-*  
*ed to have said respecting his own saying*

<sup>قُوْدٌ ثَمَانٍ مِّثْلُ أَمْرَاسٍ أَلْبَقِ \* فِيْهَا خُطُوْطٌ مِنْ سَوَادٍ وَبَلَقِ</sup>  
<sup>كَانَهُ فِي الْجِلْدِ تَوَلِيْعٌ أَلْبَقِ \* لَوَاحِقُ الْأَقْرَابِ فِيْهَا كَالْمَقِ</sup>  
*[Eight horses long in the back and neck, like ropes of*  
*hemp, wherein are streaks of black and piebald, as though*  
*that were in the skin the blotchiness of leprosy, lank in the*  
*bellies, wherein is inordinate length with slenderness*  
*(509) (Jsh),] that he meant* <sup>كَانَ ذَاكَ</sup> *[171] (K).*

§ 162. S, Khl, Akh, Mz, and F say that the  
 [detached acc. (K, B on II. 4.)] pron. is <sup>أَيَا</sup> [161]: but S  
 says that what is attached to it is a p. [560, 562] indica-  
 ting the states of the [person] referred to, vid. speaking,  
 being addressed, and absence, since <sup>أَيَا</sup> is homonymous ;  
 while Khl, Akh, and Mz say that it is a n. that <sup>أَيَا</sup> is pre.

to, because of the [anomalous (K, B)] saying [transmitted by Khl (K, B)] <sup>أَإِذَا بَلَغَ الرَّجُلُ السَّتِينَ فَآيَا</sup> <sup>الشَّوَابِ</sup> *When the man reaches the age of sixty years, let him [60] beware of the young women, which is weak, because the prons. are not pre. [112].* Zj and Sf say that <sup>آيَا</sup> is an explicit *n. pre.* to the *prons.*, as though <sup>آيَاكَ</sup> were *i. q.* <sup>نَفْسِكَ</sup> *thyself*. Many of the KK say that <sup>آيَايَ</sup>, <sup>آيَاكَ</sup>, and <sup>آيَا</sup> in their entirety are *ns.*, which is weak, since there is no *n.*, explicit or pronominal, whose final is successively <sup>ي</sup>, <sup>ك</sup>, and <sup>ا</sup>. And some of the KK and IK among the BB say that the *prons.* are the suffixes to <sup>آيَا</sup>; and that <sup>آيَا</sup> is a support for them, by means of which they become detached [161] (R).

§ 163. The attached *pron.* being shorter (Jm), the detached [*pron., nom. or acc. (Jm),*] is not allowable, except on account of the impossibility of the attached through (1) precedence [of the *pron. (Jm)*] before its *op.*, as <sup>أَيَاكَ ضَرَبْتُ</sup>; (2) separation for an object [not realized except by means of separation (Jm)], as <sup>مَا ضَرَبْتُكَ إِلَّا أَنَا</sup>, [where the object is particularization (Jm)]; while the saying {of AlFarazdak (J)}

بِالْبَاءِثِ الْوَارِثِ الْأَمْوَاتِ قَدْ ضَمَنْتِ  
أَيَاهُمْ الْأَرْضُ فِي دَهْرِ الدَّهَارِ

{*By the Raiser, the Inheritor of the dead, when the earth has inclosed them in the time of calamities!* (J)} is a poetic license (R) : (3) suppression [of its *op.* (Jm)], as <sup>رَصَّ سَ سَ</sup> اِيَاكَ وَالشَّرَّ [60] : (4) the *op.*'s being (a) *id.*, as <sup>زَيْدٌ</sup> اَنَا زَيْدٌ [24]; (b) a *p.*, when the *pron.* [governed by it (Jm)] is a *nom.*, as <sup>مَا اَنْتَ قَائِمًا</sup> مَا اَنْتَ قَائِمًا, [since the *nom. pron.* is not attached to the *p.* (Jm)] : (5) the *pron.*'s being the subject of an [*act. or pass. part. or assimilate* (R)] *ep.* applied to a person [or thing (Jm)] other than the one that [the quality denoted by] it belongs to, as <sup>هَيْدَ زَيْدٍ ضَارِبَتَهُ هِيَ</sup> هَيْدَ زَيْدٍ ضَارِبَتَهُ هِيَ [26] (IH); but that is correct only if <sup>هِيَ</sup> هِيَ be an *ag.*, not a *corrob.* [below], otherwise it would be included in the case of separation for the object of corroboration (Jm). If the *nom.* or *acc. pron.* be governed by the *v.*, it must be attached to its *op.*, except (1) when it precedes its *op.*, being then only an *acc.*, as I. 4. [20] : (2) when the *op.* is suppressed, as <sup>اَنْتَ ضَرَبْتَ</sup> اَنْتَ ضَرَبْتَ <sup>اَيَاكَ</sup> اَيَاكَ <sup>اَنْ</sup> اَنْ [62], <sup>اَنْتَ ضَرَبْتَ</sup> اَنْتَ ضَرَبْتَ [23, 591], and <sup>اَيَاكَ</sup> اَيَاكَ said in reply to "Whom shall I beat?" [45]; whereas <sup>اَيَاكَ وَالْاَسَدَ</sup> اَيَاكَ وَالْاَسَدَ [60] is a case of precedence of the *obj.* before its *op.*, [i. e. <sup>اَيَاكَ</sup> اَيَاكَ <sup>بَعْدَ</sup> بَعْدَ <sup>وَبَعْدَ</sup> وَبَعْدَ <sup>الْاَسَدَ</sup> الْاَسَدَ (R on cautioning)]: (3) when it is separated from its *op.* for an object not fulfilled except by means of separation, *vid.* when it is (a) an *appos.*, (a) a *corrob.*, as II. 33. [158]

and لَقَيْتَ زَيْدًا أَيَا ; (b) a subst., as لَقَيْتَ زَيْدًا أَيَا after  
أَخْرَجَ [154]; (c) coupled, as وَأَنْتَ : (b) after  
أَيَا , as مَا ضَرَبَ إِلَّا أَيَا and أَنَا مَا ضَرَبَ إِلَّا أَيَا ; while

وَمَا نُبَالِي إِذَا مَا كُنْتَ جَارَتِنَا \* إِلَّا يُجَاوِرُنَا إِلَّا الْكُذِبَارُ  
[And we care not, when thou art our female neighbour, that  
not any one but thou should be neighbour to us (AAz)]  
is anomalous: (c) after the sense of [ مَا and (AAz)] إِلَّا ,  
as

كَانَا يَوْمَ قَرَىٰ أَنَّمَا نَقْتُلُ إِيَّانَا \*

[by Dhu-l-Iṣṣā' al-'Adwānī, *As though we on the day of  
Kurrah were slaying only ourselves* (AAz): F says that the  
Arabs treat أَنَّمَا like the neg. and إِلَّا as respects detach-  
ment of the pron., as in the saying of AlFarazdaq

أَنَا الذَّائِدُ الْكَامِي الذَّمَارِ وَأَنَا  
يُدَافِعُ عَنْ أَحْسَابِهِمْ أَنَا أَوْ مِثْلِي

{*I am the repeller, the protector of what ought to be pro-  
tected; and only I or my like defends their honors* (Jsh)},  
like the saying {of 'Amr Ibn Ma'dikarib (AAz)}

قَدْ عَلِمَتْ سَلْمَىٰ وَجَارَاتُهَا \* مَا قَطَرَ الْفَارِسُ إِلَّا أَنَا

(ML on مَا ) *Assuredly Salmā and her female neighbours  
have known, not any one has speared and overthrown the*

*horseman but I (AAz)*: (d) after *أما أنت* , as *جاءني أما أنت* ,  
 (e) the 2nd of the two  
*objs. of علمت or أعطيت* , when attachment of the *pron.*  
 would lead to its being mistaken for the 1st *obj.*, as when  
 you make the 2nd *obj.* in *علمت زيدا أباك* and *أعطيت*  
*زيدا عمرا* [432] an *enunc.* [179], in which case you say  
*الذي علمت زيدا أياه أبوك* *He that I knew Zaid to be*  
*was thy father* and *الذي أعطيت زيدا أياه عمرو* *He that*  
*I gave to Zaid was 'Amr*, not *زيدا* nor *الذي*  
*أعطيت زيدا* , because the 2nd *obj.* would be mistaken for  
 the 1st ; whereas, if it would not be mistaken [for the 1st  
*obj.*], attachment is better in the *cat.* of *أعطيت* , and  
 detachment in that of *علمت* , as when you make the  
 2nd *obj.* in *علمت زيدا قائما* and *أعطيت زيدا درهما* an  
*enunc.*, in which case *الذي أعطيت زيدا درهم* *What I*  
*gave to Zaid was a dirham* is better than *الذي أعطيت زيدا*  
*أياه* , because you are able to attach without spoiling the  
 letter or sense, and *الذي علمت زيدا أياه قائما* *What I knew*  
*Zaid to be was standing* than *الذي علمته زيدا* , because  
 the 2nd *obj.* in the *o. f.* must be detached from its *op.*  
 for the same reason as [the *pred.*] in *كنت أياه* [164].

If the *pron.* be governed by something else than the *v.*, then, (1) if it be a *nom.*, (a) when an *inch.*, *enunc.*, *pred.* of <sup>أَنْ</sup> &c., or *sub.* of <sup>مَا</sup>, it is only detached : (b) when governed in the *nom.* by the *act.* or *pass. part.*, assimilate *ep.*, verbal *n.*, *adv.*, or *prep.* and *gen.*, then, (a) if separated from its *op.* for an object not fulfilled except by means of separation, it must be detached, as <sup>زَيْدٌ قَائِمٌ</sup> مَرَرْتُ بِرَجُلٍ فِي الدَّارِ , هَيْهَاتَ زَيْدٍ وَأَنْتَ , أَخُوهُ وَأَنْتَ ; and like it is the prominent *pron.* after the *ep.* applied to a [person or] thing other than the one that [the quality denoted by] it belongs to, since this *pron.* is a *corrob.* [above] of the *pron.* covert in the *ep.*, not its *ag.*, because you say <sup>نَحْنُ الزَّيْدُونَ صَارِبُونَهُمْ نَحْنُ</sup> and <sup>الزَّيْدَانِ الْهِنْدَانِ صَارِبَاهُمَا هُمَا</sup> , whereas you know the weakness of <sup>جَاءَنِي رَجُلٌ قَاعِدُونَ غُلَمَانَهُ</sup> [146]: (b) if governed in the *nom.* by the *ep.* or *adv.*, when the 2 latter together with the *nom.* are *props.*, vid. when they are supported upon the *interrog.* Hamza or *neg. p.*, as <sup>مَا أَقَائِمُ أَنْتُمَا</sup> , وَأَفْنَى الدَّارِ أَنْتُمَا , and <sup>قُدَّامَكَ هُمَا</sup> , it must be detached to distinguish the case where it is one of the 2 terms of the *prop.* from the case where it is not so : (c) if neither separated from its *op.* nor governed in the *nom.* by the *ep.* or *adv.* supported upon what has just been mentioned, it must be attached, because the *act.* and *pass. parts.*,



assimilate *ep.*, verbal *n.*, *adv.*, and *prep.* and *gen.* supply the place of *vs.* without needing an adjunct; but this attached *pron.* is only covert [161, 165]: (c) when governed in the *nom.* by the *inf. n.*, it is only detached, even if it follow the *inf. n.* without separation, because the *inf. n.* is not renderable by the *v.* except with the adjunct <sup>ان</sup>, as <sup>اعجبني</sup> <sup>الضرب</sup> <sup>انت</sup> <sup>زيد</sup> and <sup>اعجبني</sup> <sup>الضرب</sup> <sup>انت</sup> <sup>زيد</sup> : (2) if it be an *acc.*, then, (a) if the *op.* be such as must be detached from the *acc.* by constitution, like the Hijāzī <sup>ما</sup>, as <sup>ما</sup> <sup>زيد</sup> <sup>اياك</sup>, or if they be separated because of an object not fulfilled except by means of separation, as <sup>ما</sup> <sup>انا</sup> <sup>ضارب</sup> <sup>الا</sup> <sup>اياك</sup>, the *pron.* must be detached, as you see: (b) if neither be the case, then, (a) if the *op.* be a *p.*, the *pron.* must be attached to it, as <sup>ليتك</sup> and <sup>انك</sup> <sup>قائم</sup>, because the *p.* is not independent [134]: (b) if the *op.* be a verbal *n.*, the *pron.* must be attached to it, because, though it is *orig.* independent as respects the quality of *n.*, not in need of an *acc.*, still, since its sense becomes that of the *v.*, it is like the *v.* in the necessity of attachment to it, as <sup>حيهله</sup> and <sup>رويدة</sup>; while detachment is allowable in the case of such verbal *ns.* as the *ك* is attached to, as <sup>عليك</sup> <sup>ايلا</sup> and <sup>رويدك</sup> <sup>ايلا</sup>, only by assimilation to <sup>اعطاك</sup> <sup>ايلا</sup> [164], though the *ك* [187, 560] is not this *ك*: (c) if the *op.* be an *inf. n.*, then,

(*α*) if it be pronounced with Tanwīn, the *acc.* is not attached to it, because the Tanwīn indicative of the word's completeness is inconsistent with the attached *pron.* indicative of its incompleteness, and moreover the resemblance of the *inf. n.* to the *v.* is weak, so that you must say <sup>أعجبني</sup> ضرب <sup>أياك</sup> if you do not prefix; (*β*) if the *inf. n.* be synarthrous, the ordinary opinion is that the *pron.* should be detached after it, as <sup>أعجبني</sup> الضرب <sup>أياك</sup>, because <sup>أل</sup> alternates with the Tanwīn in making the word complete [84], while Akh allows <sup>الضربك</sup>, the *pron.* being an *acc.*: (*d*) if the *op.* be an *act.* or *pass. part.*, there is a dispute as to the attachment of the *acc. pron.* to them [113], whether they be pronounced with Tanwīn or not: [for, according to Akh and Hsh, the *pron.* after the anarthrous is in the position of the *acc.*, because it is an *obj.*, the Tanwīn and <sup>ن</sup> being suppressed not because of the prothesis, but because of the inconsistency between them and the attached *pron.*; while Rm, Mb in one of his 2 sayings, and Z say that the *pron.* after the synarthrous, whether the latter be *sing.*, *du.*, or *pl.*, is in the *gen.* by prothesis (R on the *gens.*):] and, though its attachment to them is better than its attachment to the *inf. n.*, because they resemble the *v.* more than the *inf. n.* does, still detachment of the *acc. pron.* after them is better, as <sup>أعجبني</sup> ضارب <sup>أياك</sup> or <sup>أعجبني</sup> الضارب <sup>أياك</sup> and <sup>أعطاني</sup> <sup>أياك</sup> or <sup>أعطاني</sup> <sup>أياك</sup>.

§ 164. When 2 *prons.* follow an *op.*, then, if the 2nd be an *appos.*, the 1st must be attached, and the 2nd detached, as II. 33. [158] and <sup>١٨٤</sup>رأيتك <sup>١٨٤</sup>أيام, because the *appos.* is not one of the requisites of the *v.* [131], so that it should be attached to it and be like one of its parts. But, if the 2nd be not [an *appos.*], then, (1) if one of them be an attached *nom.*, it must precede the *acc.*, because the attached *nom.* becomes like part of the *v.*; while every *pron.* that follows that *nom.* must be attached, whether it be more *det.* [262] than that *nom.*, as <sup>١٨٤</sup>ضربتني, or not, as <sup>١٨٤</sup>ضربتك, because the 2nd is as it were attached to the *op.* itself, since the attached *nom.* is like part of its *op.*: (2) if the *v.* be followed by an attached *acc.* without a *nom.* before it, as <sup>١٨٤</sup>أعطاك <sup>١٨٤</sup>زيد, or after a *nom. pron.*, as <sup>١٨٤</sup>أعطيتك, the *pron.* following that *acc.*, (a) if less *det.* than it, must be attached according to S; while others allow attachment or detachment, as <sup>١٨٤</sup>أعطاك <sup>١٨٤</sup>زيد <sup>١٨٤</sup>أعطاك Zaid gave thee it or <sup>١٨٤</sup>أعطاك <sup>١٨٤</sup>أيام, and <sup>١٨٤</sup>أعطيتك <sup>١٨٤</sup>أعطيتك I gave thee it or <sup>١٨٤</sup>أعطيتك <sup>١٨٤</sup>أيام, and similarly <sup>١٨٤</sup>أعطيتك <sup>١٨٤</sup>أعطيتك I fancied thee to be him or <sup>١٨٤</sup>أعطيتك <sup>١٨٤</sup>أعطيتك : the reason of its attachment being that there is nothing derogatory to the 2nd in being appended to, and becoming by attachment part of, what is superior to, because more *det.* than it; and the reason of its detachment being that the 1st attached is a complement, whose attachment is not like that of the *nom.*:

while detachment in the *cat.* of <sup>س</sup>خَلَّتْ is better than in that of <sup>س</sup>أَعْطَيْتَ, because, the 1st *obj.* in the *cat.* of <sup>س</sup>أَعْطَيْتَ being an *ag.* as respects the sense [432], the 2nd is as it were attached to the *pron.* of the *ag.*; whereas, the 2 *objs.* of <sup>س</sup>خَلَّتْ still containing some tinge of the *inch.* and *enunc.* [440], whose property is detachment [163], and the 1st of them being necessarily attached because of its nearness to the *v.*, detachment is better in the 2nd for observance of the *o. f.*: (b) if more *det.*, must be detached according to S; though S quotes from the GG allowance of attachment also, as <sup>س</sup>أَعْطَاهُوكَ and <sup>س</sup>أَعْطَاهَانِي, and Mb approves the opinion of the GG: while here attachment of the 2nd has not been transmitted by hearsay, because the 2nd, being superior to, as being more *det.* than, the 1st, disdains to be appended to what is inferior to it; whereas those who allow that by analogy, not by hearsay, look to the bare fact that the 1st is attached: (c) if equal to the attached *acc.*, then, (a) if they be of the 3rd *pers.*, as <sup>س</sup>أَعْطَاهُهَا and <sup>س</sup>أَعْطَاهَا, is, as S says, allowably attached, but oftener detached: (b) if not, is allowed to be attached by Mb, who approves it by analogy to the 3rd *pers.*; but not by S: while here also detachment is better, because the 2nd disdains to be appended to, and become a supplement of, what is like it; whereas that is allowable in the 3rd *pers.*, because each *pron.* relates to something else than what the other relates to,

contrary to the *prons.* of the 2nd and 1st *pers.* All of this is when the 2 *prons.* follow the *v.*: but, when they follow the *n.*, (1) if the 1st be an attached *nom.*, which is only latent [161, 163, 165], as <sup>ضَارِبُكَ</sup> <sup>زَيْدٌ</sup>, the 2nd may be attached, [as exemplified,] or detached, as <sup>زَيْدٌ</sup> <sup>ضَارِبُكَ</sup> : (2) if the 1st be a *gen.*, the 2nd, (a) if an *acc.*, is in the same predicament as when they follow the *v.* and are both *accs.*, i. e., when less *det.* [than the 1st], it may be attached or detached, as <sup>فَلَا تَطَامَعُ الْخ</sup> [503] and <sup>مُعْطِيكَهَا</sup> or <sup>مَنْعَكَ إِيَّاهَا</sup> and <sup>مُعْطِيكَ إِيَّاهَا</sup>, like <sup>أَعْطَيْتَكَهَا</sup> or <sup>أَعْطَيْتَكَ إِيَّاهَا</sup>, except that detachment in what follows the *gen.* is better than in what follows the *acc. pron.*, because the *v.* is more habituated to attachment of the *pron.* to it than the *inf. n.* and *act. part.*: and similarly, when the 2nd is more or equally *det.*, attachment is anomalous, as <sup>ضَرْبُهُوكَ</sup> and <sup>ضَرْبُهُوَا</sup>, whence

وَقَدْ جَعَلْتُ نَفْسِي تَطِيلُ لَضَعْمَةِ  
لَضَعْمِهِمَا يَقْرَعُ الْعِظَامَ نَائِيهَا

[by Mughallis Ibn Lakīṭ alAsadī, *And my soul has begun to be resigned to a calamity, because of their experiencing one like it, whose canine tooth strikes the bone, i. e. extremely severe (AAz)*]: (b) if a *nom.*, must be detached, whether it be more *det.* than the *gen.* or equally or less

*det.*, because the prominent attached *nom.* is attached only to the *v.* [161, 165], as ضَرْبُهُ هُوَ , ضَرْبُكَ أَنَا , and ضَرْبُكَ هُوَ : (3) the 1st is not an *acc.*, except according to the opinion of Hsh and Akh on such as ضَارِبُكَ [163], in which case the predicament of the *pron.* that follows it, according to them, is the same as that of the *pron.* that follows the *gen.* (R). The [pronominal (M, IA)] *pred.* of كَانَ , &c., [may be attached or detached: but (IA)] is preferably detached (M, IH, IA) according to S, as كُنْتُ أَيُّهَا (IA), because it is *orig. an enunc.* [447], which must be detached [163] (AAz); and attached according to IM, as كُنْتُه (IA): the poet [ʿUmar Ibn Abi Rabi'a (R, AAz)] says

لَئِنْ كَانَ أَيُّهَا لَقَدْ حَالَ بَعْدَنَا \* عَنِ الْعَهْدِ وَالْأَنْسَانِ قَدْ يَتَغَيَّرُ

[Assuredly, if he be he, he has indeed changed, after quitting us, from the youthful state: and man does sometimes alter (AAz)], and [the same poet (AAz)] says

لَيْتَ هَذَا اللَّيْلَ شَهْرًا \* لَا نَرَى فِيهَا غَرِيبًا  
لَيْسَ أَيُّهَا وَأَيَّا \* كِ وَلَا نَخْشَى رَقِيبًا

[Would that this night were a month, wherein we saw not any one, except me and thee, nor feared a watcher! (AAz)]; but a poet [says تَنَفَّكَ الْخ (454), and Ibn Duraid (AAz)] says

حَدَّدْتُ قَوْمِي كَعَدِيدِ الطَّبَسِ \* إِنْ ذَهَبَ الْقَوْمُ الْكَرَامُ لَيْسَ

[*I numbered my people like the number of the multitudinous sand, when the generous men other than I (170) were gone (AAz)*], and an Arab said عَلَيْهِ رَجُلًا لَيْسَنِي *Let him keep to a man that is not I* [170, 199] (M, R), the reason of the attachment being that كُنْتَهُ is like ضَرْبَهُ [97].

§ 165. No *pron.* is latent except the [attached] *nom.*, because the *acc.* and *gen.* are complements, since they are *objs.*; whereas the *nom.* is an *ag.*, which is like part of the *v.*, so that in the *cat.* of the attached *prons.*, which are constituted for abridgment, they content themselves with expressing the *v.* The cause of its latency, where it is latent, has been mentioned [161]. The attached [*nom.*] *pron.* does not appear at all in the case of (1) the *pret.*, 3rd *pers. sing.*, *masc.* and *fem.*; (2) the *aor.*, in أَفْعَلُ, نَفْعَلُ, يَفْعَلُ, and تَفْعَلُ 2nd *pers. sing. masc.* or 3rd *pers. sing. fem.*; (3) [the *imp.*] أَفْعَلُ; (4) all the *eps.*, verbal *ns.*, and *advs.* [161, 163]: nor does the *ag.*, explicit or pronominal, appear in the case of 5 of them, vid. أَفْعَلُ, نَفْعَلُ, تَفْعَلُ 2nd *pers. sing. masc.*, the *imp.* أَفْعَلُ, and the *imp.* verbal *n.* in the *sing.*, *du.*, and *pl.*; while what appears in II. 33. [158] is a *corrob.* of the latent [*pron.*], not an *ag.*: but the explicit *ag.*

and the detached *pron.* appear in the case of (1) فعل ,  
 ضَرَبَ 3rd pers. sing. fem., as فَعَلَتْ , يَفْعَلُ , and تَفْعَلُ  
 مَا تَضْرِبُ إِلَّا and مَا تَضْرِبُ هَذَا , مَا ضَرَبْتَ إِلَّا هِيَ and هِيَ  
 مَا قَاتَمُ [24] أَقَاتَمُ الزَّيْدَانِ (2) the sing. ep., as  
 أَفَى الدَّارِ زَيْدٌ and هُمَا (3) the adv. when supported, as  
 مَا فِي الدَّارِ هُوَ (4) the verbal *n.* when enunciatory, as  
 هِيَهَاتَ هُوَ and هِيَهَاتَ زَيْدٌ (R). The saying of the GG  
 on II. 33. that the coupling is to the latent *pron.* is a  
 mistake, and has been refuted by IM, who holds it to be  
 a coupling of *props.*, orig. وَلَيْسَكِي زَوْجَكِ and (let) thy  
 wife (dwell), and likewise says that لَا نَخْلِفُهُ نَحْنُ وَلَا  
 أَنْتِ XX. 60. That we shall not break, nor (shalt) thou  
 (break) is in full لَا تَخْلِفُهُ أَنْتِ وَلَا , because [the coupled is  
 in the predicament of the *ant.* (538), whereas] the *nom.* of  
 the *imp. v.* is not an explicit *n.*, and the *nom.* of the *aor. v.*  
 possessed of the *و* is nothing else than the *pron.* of the  
 1st pers.; while he allows ذُرُو in

نَطُوفُ مَا نَطُوفُ ثُمَّ نَاوِي \* ذُرُو الْأَمْوَالِ مِنَّا وَالْعَدِيمِ  
 إِلَى حَفْرِ أَسَانِلِهِنَّ جَوْفُ \* وَأَعْلَاهُنَّ صَفَاحُ مُقِيمِ

[by AlBurj Ibn Mushir atTā'i, We roam about so long  
 as we roam about; then repair, the possessors of riches



of us and the destitute (repair), to holes (i. e. graves) whose bottoms are wide, and whose top is a broad stone standing fast (Jsh)] to be ag of a suppressed v. of the 3rd pers., i. e. <sup>يَاوِي</sup> <sup>نُور</sup> <sup>الْأَمْوَالِ</sup>, or, with what follows it, a corrob. [of the pron. in <sup>نَاوِي</sup> (DM)] upon the principle of <sup>ضَرَبَ</sup> <sup>زَيْدَ</sup> <sup>الظَّهْرَ</sup> <sup>وَالْبَطْنَ</sup> [154] (ML).

§ 166. The form of (IH) a detached nom. [pron. (M, R) agreeing with the *inch.* (III) in number, gender, and person, as <sup>أَنْتَى</sup> <sup>أَنَا</sup> <sup>اللَّهُ</sup> XXVIII. 30. *Verily I am God* and <sup>أَنْتَ</sup> <sup>هُوَ</sup> <sup>الْغَفُورُ</sup> <sup>الرَّحِيمُ</sup> XII. 99. *Verily He is the forgiving, the merciful*, but sometimes in the 3rd pers. after a 1st or 2nd, because the latter occupies the place of a *pre n.*, as

وَكَاثِنٌ بِالْأَبَاطِحِ مِنْ صَدِيقٍ \* يَرَانِي لَوْ أَصَابَتْهُ هُوَ الْمَصَابَا

{by Jarīr, *And how many a friend there is of mine in the wide pebbly watercourses, who would think (the affliction of) me, if I were afflicted, to be the great affliction!* (Jsh)}, i. e. <sup>يَرَى</sup> <sup>مُصَابِي</sup> <sup>هُوَ</sup> <sup>الْمَصَابُ</sup> (R),] intervenes between the *inch.* and [its (M')] *enunc.*, before and after [prefixion of (M, R)] the [*lit.* (M)] *ops.* [of the *inch.* and *enunc.*, vid. the *cat.* of <sup>ظَلَى</sup>, the *cat.* of <sup>أَنَّ</sup>, the *Iijāzi* مَا, and the *cat.* of <sup>كَانَ</sup> (R)], when the *enunc.* is *det.* or [similar thereto, like

(M)] <sup>اَفْعَلُ</sup> <sup>مِنْ</sup> <sup>كُذَّا</sup> (M, IH), as <sup>زَيْدٌ هُوَ الْمُنْطَلِقُ</sup> *Zaid*  
*is the departer*, [XVIII. 37. (419), <sup>وَلَا تَحْسِبْنِي الْذِيْنِ</sup>  
<sup>يَبْخُلُوْنَ</sup> <sup>بِمَا آتَاهُمُ اللّٰهُ مِنْ فَضْلِهِ</sup> <sup>هُوَ خَيْرًا لِّهَمْ</sup> III. 175.  
(443) *And do not thou account (the niggardliness of)*  
*them that are niggardly of what God hath vouchsafed them*  
*of His bounty to be better for them* (M), i. e. <sup>بَخُلُ الْذِيْنِ</sup>  
(K, B), XII. 99., <sup>مَا زَيْدٌ هُوَ الْمُنْطَلِقُ</sup> *Zaid is not the*  
*departer* (R), <sup>اِنْ كَانَ هَذَا هُوَ الْحَقُّ</sup> VIII. 32. *If this*  
*be the truth* (M),] and <sup>كُنْتَ اَنْتَ الرَّقِيْبُ عَلَيْهِمْ</sup> V. 117.  
*Thou wast the watcher over them* (M, R). It is named  
[by the BB (M, R)] *distinctive* (M, IH, IA), because,  
[say the moderns (R),] it distinguishes the [case where  
what follows it is an (R)] *enunc.* from the [case  
where it is an (R)] *ep.* (R, IA), since, when you say <sup>زَيْدٌ</sup>  
<sup>الْمُنْطَلِقُ</sup>, the hearer may imagine <sup>الْمُنْطَلِقُ</sup> to be an *ep.*,  
and therefore await the *enunc.*, so that you put the distinc-  
tive to specify that it is an *enunc.*, not an *ep.*; or because,  
say Khl and S, it distinguishes the *n.* before it from the  
one after it by indicating that the latter is not a supple-  
ment [140] of the former, but is its *enunc.* (R): and by  
the KK *support* (M, R), because it keeps what follows it  
from falling from the status of *enunc.*, as the support  
in the house keeps the roof from falling (R). The



*enunc.* is similar to the synarthrous, vid. the <sup>أَفْعَلُ</sup> of superiority, which resembles the synarthrous in that its particularizer is a *p.*, vid. <sup>مِنْ</sup> [355], united with it, as the particularizer of the synarthrous is a *p.* united with it, i. e. the <sup>ج</sup> (R). The conditions of the *pron.* named distinctive and support are [thus] 6, (1) that what precedes it should be (a) an *inch.*, actually or *orig.*, as <sup>أُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ</sup> VII. 156. *Those shall be the prosperous,* <sup>وَإِنَّا لَنُحْشِ الْأَصْنَافُونَ</sup> XXXVII. 165. *And verily we are the standers in ranks,* V. 117., LXXIII. 20. [440], and XVIII. 37.; but Akh allows it to occur between the *d. s.* and *s. s.*, holding <sup>هَؤُلَاءِ بَنَاتِي هُنَّ أَطْهَرُ لَكُمْ</sup> XI. 80. *These are my daughters, purer for you,* [read by Ibn Marwān (K, DM), Sa'id Ibn Jubair, Al-Ḥasan al-Basrī, and Zaid Ibn 'Alī (DM)] with <sup>أَطْهَرُ</sup> in the *acc.*, to be an instance of it: (b) *det.*, as exemplified; but Fr, Hsh, and such of the KK as follow them allow it to be *indet.*, attributing <sup>أَنْ تَكُونَ أُمَّةٌ هِيَ أَرْبَى مِنْ أُمَّةٍ</sup> XVI. 94. *Because a people is more numerous and wealthy than a people to it :* (2) that what follows it should be (a) an *enunc.* actually or *orig.*: (b) *det.*, or like the *det.* in not receiving <sup>أَلْ</sup>, as above in the case of <sup>خَيْرًا</sup> LXXIII. 20. and <sup>أَقْلَ</sup> XVIII. 73.; while the condition of the one like the

*det.* is that it should be a *n.*, as exemplified: but Jj coordinates the *aor* with the *n.*, because of their mutual resemblance, holding <sup>هوَ يَبْدِي وَيُعِيدُ</sup> *انه هو يبدى* LXXXV. 13.

*Verily He produceth and reproduceth* to be an instance of it; and is followed by AB, who allows the distinctive in <sup>وَمَنْزِرُ أَوْلَيْكَ هُوَ يَبُورُ</sup> XXXV. 11. *And the plotting of those shall prove vain*; and by IKhz, who says that there is no difference between *accidental* prevention of

<sup>أَلْ</sup> *أَلْ*, as in <sup>أَفْعَلُ مِنْ</sup> *أَفْعَلُ مِنْ*, [where the preventive of <sup>أَلْ</sup> *أَلْ* is the (DM),] and in the *pre.*, like <sup>مِثْلِكَ</sup> *مِثْلِكَ*, [where the preventive is the prothesis (DM)], and *natural*, as in the

[*pret.* and (DM)] *aor. v.*; while Suh says on <sup>وَإِنَّهُ هُوَ أَضْحَكَ وَأَبْكَى وَإِنَّهُ هُوَ أَمَاتَ وَأَحْيَا وَإِنَّهُ خَلَقَ الزَّوْجَيْنِ</sup> *وَإِنَّهُ هُوَ أَضْحَكَ وَأَبْكَى وَإِنَّهُ هُوَ أَمَاتَ وَأَحْيَا وَإِنَّهُ خَلَقَ الزَّوْجَيْنِ*

<sup>الذَّكَرَ وَالْأُنْثَى</sup> LIII. 44—46 *And that He hath made to laugh and made to weep, and that He hath killed and made alive, and that He hath created the two mates, the male and the female* that the distinctive *pron.* is put in the first 2 [verses], and not in the 3rd, because some of the heathen sometimes attribute these acts to others

than God, as Nimrod says <sup>أَنَا أَحْيَى وَأَمِيتُ</sup> II. 260.

*I make alive and kill*, whereas the 3rd has not been claimed by any of mankind; and the text <sup>وَيَرَى الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْعِلْمَ</sup> *وَيَرَى الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْعِلْمَ*

XXXIV. 6. *And they that have been vouchsafed knowledge know*

*And they that have been vouchsafed knowledge know*

what hath been revealed to thee from thy Lord to be the truth and to guide aright is sometimes cited as evidence in favour of Jj's saying, <sup>أَيُّ</sup>يُحْدِ being coupled to [the 2nd *obj.* (DM)] <sup>الْحَقُّ</sup>الْحَقُّ occurring as *enunc.* after the distinctive: (3) that it itself should be (a) in the form of the *nom.*; (b) in agreement with what precedes it [in person, gender, and number (DM)]. Its import is (1) *lit.*, *vid.* notification from the very first that what follows it is an *enunc.*, not an *appos*; (2) *id.*, *vid.* corroboration; (3) also *id.*, *vid.* particularization, [i. e. restriction of the predicament to the mentioned, and negation of it from all others (DM)]: and Z mentions all three in the exposition of <sup>وَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ</sup>وَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ II. 4. *And those shall be the prosperous*, saying that its import is (1) indication that what follows it is an *enunc.*, not an *ep.*; (2) corroboration; (3) affirmation that the import of the attribute is predicable of the subject exclusively of others (ML). Some of the Arabs make it an *inch.*, and what follows it its *enunc.*; [and accordingly <sup>وَمَا ظَلَمْنَاهُمْ وَلَكِنْ كَانُوا</sup>وَمَا ظَلَمْنَاهُمْ وَلَكِنْ كَانُوا <sup>هُمْ الظَّالِمُونَ</sup>هُمْ الظَّالِمُونَ XLIII. 76. *Nor have We wronged them; but (545) they were such that they were the wrong-doers* and <sup>أَنَا أَقَلُّ</sup>أَنَا أَقَلُّ XVIII. 37. *to be such that I am less* are read (M, R) with the *nom.* among others than the Seven (R)].

§ 167. The *prop.* is preceded by a *pron.* [of the 3rd *pers.* (IH) *sing.*, *marc.* or *fem.* (R)], named the

pron. of the <sup>شأن</sup> case [when masc. (Jm)] and <sup>قصة</sup> fact [when fem. (Jm)], but by the KK {the pron. of (R)} the unknown (M, R), because that case is unknown until the pron. is (R) expounded by the prop. {mentioned (Jm)} after it (III), as CXII. 1. (160) (M)]. It is [according to the ops. (III)] (1) attached, (a) prominent, [an acc., in the cats. of <sup>ظننى</sup> and <sup>ان</sup> (R), as in <sup>ظننته زيد</sup> I thought the case to be this, Zaid was standing and قائم] LXXII. 19. <sup>وانه لما قام عبد الله</sup> And that the case was this, when the serrant of God stood (M)]; (b) latent (M, III), a nom., in the cats. of <sup>كان</sup> and <sup>كأن</sup> (R), as in their saying <sup>ليس خلق الله مثله</sup> The case is not this, God has created his like and IX. 118. [460] (M): (2) detached (III), when an *inch.* or a *sub.* of <sup>ما</sup> (R). It is [preferably (R)] fem. when the [expos. (R)] prop. contains a fem., as <sup>فانها لا تعمى الابصار</sup> XXII. 45. For verily the fact is this, the eyes are not blind, [ <sup>اولم تكن لهم اية</sup> ] XXVI. 197. (M), so read by Ibn 'Amir (B), And was not the fact this, that the learned of the children of Israel should know it was a sign for them? (K,B), or they had a sign, that the learned &c? (K),] and <sup>على انها تغفر الخ</sup> [507] (M, R), provided that the fem. in the prop. be not a complement or like a complement, so that <sup>انها بنيت غرفة</sup> or <sup>انها كان</sup>

القرآن معجزة [19, 447] is not preferable, because, the *pron.* being intended, important, its agreement with complements is not observed. This *pron.* may not be suppressed, from want of indication of it [1], since the *enunc* is independent, not containing a connecting *pron.* [27] (R). Its suppression, when it is an *acc*, [however, is allowable, because it becomes a quasi-complement through being governed in the *acc.*, and is besides indicated by the sentence, as <sup>ان</sup> <sup>من</sup> <sup>يدخل</sup> <sup>البحر</sup> (517) and <sup>ان</sup> <sup>من</sup> <sup>لام</sup> <sup>البحر</sup> (1), the indication here being that the annullers of the *inch.* are not prefixed to *cond.* words; but (R)] is weak, except with <sup>ان</sup> when contracted [525], in which case it is necessary (IH). The reading of XX. 66. [171] is said to be *orig.* <sup>ان</sup> <sup>هذان</sup> <sup>لهما</sup> <sup>ساحران</sup> [27], the [2nd] *inch.* [<sup>ان</sup>] being then suppressed, and the *pron.* of the case, as in <sup>ان</sup> <sup>من</sup> <sup>اشد</sup> <sup>الناس</sup> <sup>البحر</sup> [517] (Sh). This *pron.* is irregular in 5 ways:—(1) it necessarily relates to what follows it [160], since it may not be preceded by the *prop. expos.* of it, nor by any part thereof; and ISf errs in saying on

<sup>اسكران</sup> <sup>كان</sup> <sup>ابن</sup> <sup>المراغة</sup> <sup>ان</sup> <sup>هجا</sup> <sup>تميما</sup> <sup>بجو</sup> <sup>الشام</sup> <sup>ام</sup> <sup>متساكر</sup>

[by AlFarazdaq, *What! drunk was Ibn AlMarāgha* (i.e. *Jarīr*) when he satirized Tamīm in the region of Syria, or shamming drunk? (Jsh)] that <sup>كان</sup> contains



the *pron.* of the case, and <sup>أَبِي</sup> <sup>الْمُرَاغَةِ</sup> <sup>سَكْرَانٍ</sup> are *inch.* and *enunc.*, the *prop.* being *pred.* of <sup>كَانَ</sup>, whereas correctly <sup>كَانَ</sup> is *red.*: (2) its exponent is only a *prop.*: and no *pron.* shares with it in this, [since the exponent of every other *pron.* is a single term (DM)]: (3) it is not followed by an *appos.*, not being corroborated [135], nor coupled to [158], nor followed by a *subst.* [154]: (4) it is governed only by inchoation or one of its annullers: (5) it is invariably *sing.*, not being dualized or pluralized, even if it be expounded by 2 or more *stories* (ML). The BB hold that both terms of the *expos. prop.* must be expressed, because, it being *expos.*, its own 2 terms ought to be independent of exponent. The exponent, when the annullers of the *inch.* are not prefixed to the *pron.*, must be a noniual *prop.*, [as CXII. 1.]; but, when they are prefixed to it, may be verbal also, as XXII. 45. (R). The *prop.* occurring as *enunc.* or *pred.* to the *pron.* of the case must be enunciatory, whatever is transmitted to the contrary being paraphrased, except the *pred.* of the contracted <sup>أَنَّ</sup> <sup>أَنَّ</sup>, which may be a precatory *prop.*, as in the reading of XXIV. 9. [34, 525] (ML).

§ 168. The *pron.* in <sup>وَسَّوْهُ</sup> <sup>رَبِّهِ</sup> <sup>وَجَلَّا</sup> [498] is a vague *indet.* [262, 505], thrown out at hazard without aim at any particular person, and afterwards expounded [84, 160]; and like it in vagueness and exposition is the *pron.* in <sup>نَعَمْ</sup> <sup>رَجُلًا</sup> [84, 160, 469].

§ 169. When the *n.* occurring after <sup>أَنَا</sup>لَوْلَا and <sup>عَسَى</sup> is a *pron.*, the general practice is to say <sup>أَنْتَ</sup>لَوْلَا <sup>أَنْتَ</sup>, <sup>أَنَا</sup>لَوْلَا <sup>أَنَا</sup>, and <sup>عَسَيْتُ</sup>, as <sup>لَكِنَّا</sup>مُؤْمِنِينَ <sup>عَسَيْتُ</sup>, <sup>لَوْلَا</sup>أَنَا <sup>عَسَيْتُ</sup>, XXXIV. 30. *If it had not been for you, we should have been believers* and <sup>فَهَلْ</sup>عَسَيْتُمْ XLVII. 24. [462]: but trustworthy persons transmit from the Arabs <sup>لَوْلَاكَ</sup>, <sup>عَسَانِي</sup>, and <sup>عَسَاكَ</sup>, <sup>لَوْلَاكَ</sup>, as

وَكَمْ مَوْطِنٍ لَوْلَاكَ طَلَحْتَ كَمَا هَوَى  
بِاجْرَامِهِ مِنْ قُلَّةِ النَّيْقِ مِنْهُوَى

[by Yazīd Ibn AlḤakam, *And how many a place of combat, if I (had) not (been present with thee) wouldst thou have perished (in), as a faller falls with his limbs from the summit of the peak ! (J)*],

أَوْ مَتَّ بِكَفَيْهَا مِنْ الْهُودَجِ \* لَوْلَاكَ هَذَا الْعَامَ لَمْ أَحْجِجْ  
[by ‘Umar Ibn Abī Rabī‘a, *She signed with her two hands from the litter, saying, If thou (hadst) not (been with me) this year, I should not have performed the pilgrimage (Jsh)*],

تَقُولُ بِنْتِي قَدْ أَتَى <sup>أَنَا</sup>إِنَّا \* يَا ابْنَتَا عَلِكَ أَوْ عَسَاكَ  
[by Ru‘ba Ibn Al‘Ajjā, *My daughter says, Thy time of departure has arrived. O my father, perhaps thou, or may-be thou, (wilt find sustenance) (Jsh)*], and

رُفِي نَفْسِي أَقُولُ أَهَّا إِذَا مَا \* تَنَازَعْنِي لَعَلِّي أَوْ عَسَانِي

[by 'Imrān Ibn Hittān, *And I have a soul, to which I say, whenever it opposes me, Perhaps I, or may-be I, (shall attain mine object) (AAz)*]; while authorities differ as to [the explanation of] that (M). S and the majority say that **لَوْلَا** is a *prep.* [513], peculiar to the *pron.*, as **حَتَّى** [501] and the **ي** [509] are peculiar to the explicit *n.*, and not depending upon any thing [498]; and that the position of its *gen.* is that of a *nom.* by inchoation, the *enunc.* being suppressed [29, 574]: while Akh says that the *pron.* is an *inch.*, and **لَوْلَا** not a *prep.*, but that they substitute the *gen. pron.* for the *nom.*, as they do the converse, since they say **مَا أَنَا كَأَنْتَ وَلَا أَنْتَ كَأَنَا** [509]; whereas substitution occurs only in the case of the detached *prons.*, [a refutation of Akh's saying (DM),] because of their resemblance to explicit *ns.* in their independence. On **عَسَانِي** [in some MSS **عَسَانِي** (170) (DM),] &c. [459, 462], there are 3 opinions:—(1) S says that **عَسَى** is treated like **لَعَلَّ** in governing the *sub.* in the *acc.* and *pred.* in the *nom.* [516], as **لَعَلَّ** is treated like it in having its *pred.* conjoined with **أَنْ** [536]: (2) Akh says that it continues to govern like **كَأَنَّ** [459]; but that the *acc. pron.* is borrowed in place of the *nom. pron.*: which is

refuted by two matters. (a) that substitution of one *pron.* for another is authorized only in the case of the detached [*pron.*], as مَا أَنَا كَأَنَّتُ الْخَ while in يَا ابْنِ الزُّبَيْرِ الْخَ [129] the كَ is an etymological *subst.* [682] for the تَ, [being a case of conversion (DM).] not a case of substitution of one *pron.* for another, as IM thinks; (b) that the *pred.* appears governed in the *nom.* in

فَقُلْتُ عَسَاهَا نَارُ كَأَنِّي وَعَلَهَا \* تَشْكِي فَأَتِي نَحْوَهَا فَأَعُودُهَا

[by Ṣakhr Ibn Al'Abbūd alKhidrimī, *Then said I, May be it is the fire of Ka's; and perhaps she will complain, and I shall come towards her, and visit her* (Jsh)]:

(3) Mb and F say that it continues to govern like كَأَن; but that, the sentence being transposed, [what ought to be (DM)] the *sub.* is made *pred.*, and conversely. [the يَ in in أَقُومُ عَسَانِي أَنْ أَقُومُ being its *prepos. pred.*, and أَنْ أَقُومُ its *postpos. sub.* (DM)]: which is refuted by its entailing in such as يَا ابْنَتَا الْخَ [above] restriction [of the expression (DM)] to a *v.* and its *acc.*, [while the *nom.*, vid. its *postpos. sub.*, is suppressed (DM)]; but they may reply that the *acc.* here is a *nom.* in sense, since their assertion is that the inflection is transposed, while the sense is unaltered.

§ 170. The يَ of *protection*, named also the نَ of *support*, is affixed before the يَ of the 1st *pers.*, (1) when governed in the *acc.* by (a) the *v.*, whether plastic, as

مَا عَدَانِي or قَامُوا مَا خَلَانِي and عَسَانِي, or aplastic, as اَكْرَمْنِي, or *حَاشَانِي* if *حَاشَى* be held to be a *v.* [511]; (b) the verbal *n.*, as دَرَاكْنِي, تَرَاكْنِي, and عَلَيْنِي : (c) the *p.* [ اِنِّى , &c. (516) DM)], as اِنِّى : (2) when governed in the *gen.* by مَنْ and عَنْ : (3) when *rest.* to لَدُنْ, قَدْ [187], or قَطًا : (4) in other cases anomalously, as بِجَلْنِي i. q. حَسْبِي *my sufficiency* [187] and اَمْسَاكْنِي الْخ [609] (ML). The ن of protection is introduced into the *v.* to protect it from the Kasr, because what precedes the ي of the 1st *pers.* must be pronounced with Kasr; whereas, since they debar the *v.* from the *gen.* [104], and the Kasra is the original sign of the *gen.* [16], they dislike that what is sometimes the sign of the *gen.* should be found in the *v.* : while its introduction in such as اَعْطَانِي and يَعْطِينِي is either for the sake of uniformity, or because the Kasr would be supplied upon the ا and ي, if it were not for the ن, as in عَصَايَ and قَاصِي; and its introduction with the ن of inflection, as يَضْرِبُونَنِي, the ن of corroboration, as اَضْرِبْنِي, and the attached *nom. pron.*, as ضَرْبَتْنِي and يَضْرِبَتْنِي, is allowable because the نs of inflection and corroboration and the *prons.* mentioned are like part of the *v.* This ن is inseparable from (1) all the paradigms of the *pret.* : (2) the *aor.* [including the *imp.*], except the five paradigms

containing the **و** of inflection [405], whether the *nom.* [or *imp.*] contain the **و** of the *pron.* or the single or double **و** of corroboration, as **بُضْرُنِنِي** and

**هَلْ تَبْلُغُنِي دَابَّهَا شَدْنِيَّةٌ \* لَعْنَتْ بِمَكْرُومِ الشَّرَابِ مَضْرُومٌ**

[by 'Antara, *Will a Shadanī she-camel cursed with an udder deburred from milk, cut off, bring me to her dwelling?* (EM)], or not. The place of the **و** of protection may be supplied by the **و** of inflection, contrary to the **و** of the *pron.* and the two **و**s of corroboration, although combination of two likes is realized in the case of all, because, the **و** of inflection having no meaning, like the **و** of protection, each of them is for a *lit.* matter, contrary to the **و** of the *pron.* and the two **و**s of corroboration. This is according to the opinion of those who, like Jz, hold the elided to be the **و** of protection, because the heaviness comes from it, not from the **و** of inflection; whereas according to the saying of S. that the elided is the **و** of inflection, because it is exposed to elision in the *apoc.* and *subj.* and has no meaning, the cause of the non-elision of the **و** of the *pron.* and two **و**s of corroboration is obvious, since they are not exposed to elision and have a meaning. Elision of the **و** of protection with the **و** of the *pron.* occurs, however, by poetic license, as

**تَرَاهُ كَالْتِغَامِ يَعْلُ مَسْكًا \* يَسْوِي الْغَالِيَاتِ إِذَا فَلَينِي**

[by 'Amr Ibn Ma'dīkarib azZubaidī, *Thou seest it (the hair of the head) like wormwood steeped in musk, vexing*

the women rummaging for lice when they anannage me for lice, orig. <sup>فَلَيَنْنِي</sup> (Jsh)], where the elided may not be the <sup>ن</sup> of the *pron*, since the *ag.* is not suppressed. Three methods are allowable with the <sup>ن</sup> of inflection, elision of one <sup>ن</sup>, incorporation of the <sup>ن</sup> of inflection into the <sup>ن</sup> of protection, and expression of both without incorporation; and VL. 80. [405] is read according to all three. Expression of the <sup>ن</sup> with <sup>لَيْسَ</sup> is better, as <sup>اِنْ ذَهَبَ لَيْسَ عَلَيْهِ رَجُلًا اَلْخ</sup> [164]; but <sup>لَيْسَ</sup> is allowable, as <sup>اِنْ ذَهَبَ لَيْسَ</sup> [164], by assimilation to <sup>غَيْرِي</sup>; and <sup>عَسَايَ</sup> occurs by assimilation to <sup>لَعَلِّي</sup>; but <sup>عَسَانِي</sup> is more frequent (R). It is disputed whether the <sup>ن</sup> of protection be inseparable from the <sup>اَفْعَلَّ</sup> of wonder or not, as <sup>مَا اَفْقَرَنِي اَلْخ</sup> [477] or <sup>مَا اَفْقَرِي</sup>; but the correct opinion is that it is inseparable (IA). The <sup>ن</sup> may be affixed to verbal *ns.*, because they convey the sense of the *v.*; or omitted, because they are not *orig. vs.* [187]. The <sup>ن</sup> may be affixed to <sup>اَنْ</sup>, <sup>اَنَّ</sup>, <sup>اِنْ</sup>, and <sup>كَاَنَّ</sup>, because they resemble the *v.* [516]; or elided, because the affixion is due to the resemblance, and is not original, and because of the combination of likes, together with the frequency of usage (R). <sup>لَعَلَّ</sup> is correctly denuded of the <sup>ن</sup>, as XL. 38. [411]; and expression of the <sup>ن</sup> is rare, as

فَقُلْتُ اعْبِرَانِي الْقَدُومَ لَعَلَّنِي \* أَخْطَا بِهَا قَبْرًا لَابْيَضٍ مَاجِدٍ

[Then said I, Lend ye two to me the adze: perhaps I shall carve with it a scabbard for a glorious sword (J)].

The ى is not elided with لَيْتَ, except extraordinarily, as

كَمَنْبَةٍ جَابِرٍ إِنْ قَالَ لَيْتَنِي \* أَصَادِفُهُ وَافْتَدَى بَعْضُ مَالِي

[by Zaid AlKhail, *Like the wish of Jābir, when he said, Would that I were to find him, and I would lose some of my property for the sake of slaying him (J)*]; but is commonly expressed, as IV. 75. [411] (IA). Jz says that expression of the ى in the case of مَنْ, عَنْ, قَدْ, and قَطْ is better known; but according to S elision is a license not allowable except in poetry, as

أَيُّهَا السَّائِلُ عَنْهُمْ وَعَنْيَ \* لَسْتُ مِنْ قَيْسٍ وَلَا قَيْسٌ مِنْي

[O thou asker about them and about me, I am not of Kais, nor is Kais of me (J)] and

قَدْنِي مِنْ نَصْرِ الْخُبَيْبَيْنِ قَدِي  
لَيْسَ الْإِمَامُ بِالشَّحِيمِ الْمَلْحَدِ

[by Humaid Ibn Mālik alArkaṭ, *My sufficiency is the help (مِنْ being red.) of the two Khubaibs* ('Abd Allāh Ibn AzZubair, surnamed Abū Khubaib, and his son Khubaib), *my sufficiency: the Imām* (Khubaib Ibn 'Abd



Allāh) *is not the unrighteous niggard* (J)] : and the ى is affixed for preservation of the inseparable quiescence [of the final]. According to S and Z], elision of the ى from لَدُنْ is not allowable, except by poetic license ; whereas, according to others, expression is preferable, but elision is not a poetic license, because it is authorized among the Seven, [ قَدْ بَلَغْتَ مِنْ لَدُنِّي عَذْرًا XVIII. 75. *Thou hast obtained from me an excuse* being read لَدُنِّي (K, B) by Nāfi' (B)] ; but III follows Jz, who says that you are allowed an option in the case of لَدُنْ, the reading inducing them to say so : and affixion of the ى to لَدُنْ, though it is not a *v.*, is for preservation of the inseparable quiescence of the ى. Elision is better than expression in the case of بِجُلْ, because of the dislike to a quiescent ج before the ى, and from the difficulty of pronouncing it.

§ 170.A. The most particular of the *prons.* is the *pron.* of the 1st *pers.*, then that of the 2nd *pers.*, then that of the 3rd ; and in combination the more particular prevails, as اَنَا وَاَنْتَ قُلْنَا or اَنَا وَهُوَ and اَنْتَ وَهُوَ قُلْنَا (R).

## THE DEMONSTRATIVES.

§. 171. The *dem.* is what indicates a denominate and demonstration of that denominate: you say, when demonstrating Zaid for example, هَذَا *This*, the word ذَا indicating the person Zaid and demonstration of that person (Sh). The *dems.* are the *ns.* that the denominate is demonstrated by; and on that account they contain the sense of the *v.*, and therefore govern *ds s.* [75] (IY). Only a visible sensible [object], near or distant, is *orig.* demonstrated by the *dems.*: so that, if an invisible sensible [object] be demonstrated by them, as تِلْكَ الْجَنَّةُ XIX. 64. *That is the Paradise*, this is because it is made to be like the visible; and similarly if what is imperceptible by the senses be demonstrated by them, as VI. 102. [172] and XII. 37. [561] (R). The *dems.* are (1) *sing.*, (a) *masc.* ذَا : (b) *fem.* تَا, تِى, تَهْ [or تَهِي, with slurring or impletion (R)], ذَهْ, ذِهْ [or ذِهِي, with slurring or impletion (R)], ذِي, ذَا (R): (2) *du.*, (a) *masc.*, [in the *nom.* (M, Jm)] ذَاي, and [in the *acc.* and *gen.* (M, Jm)] ذَيْن, [but in some *dials.* ذَان, whence إِنَّ هَٰذَانِ لَسَاحِرَآئِنِ XX. 66. *Verily these two*

are two enchanters (174) (M)]; (b) *fem.*, [in the *nom.* (IY, Jm)] تَانِي, and [in the *acc.* and *gen.* (IY, Jm)] تَيْنِي, [تَانِي being the only *fem. dial. var.* dualized (M, Jm), because of the frequency of its occurrence (Jm)]: (3) *pl., masc.* and *fem.* اُولَآءِ [or اُولَآءِ, a heteromorphous *pl.*, the measure of which is فُعَال upon the measure of غُرَاب (IY)], pronounced with prolongation or abbreviation (M, III), and in the latter case [generally] written with the ي (R, Jm); which is common to the rational and irrational, as

فَمِ الْمَنَازِلَ بَعْدَ مَنْزِلَةِ اللّٰوِي  
وَالْعَبَشِ بَعْدَ اُولَئِكَ الْاَيَّامِ

(M, R), by Jarīr (M, J), *Disparage thou* [661] *the halting-places after quitting the halting-place of al-Liwā, and life after the passing of those days* (J), where it is used for the irrational (IY, J), as in اِنِ السَّمْعَ وَالْبَصَرَ used for the irrational (IY, J), as in اِنِ السَّمْعَ وَالْبَصَرَ وَالْقُلُوبَ كُلَّ اُولَئِكَ كَانَ عَنْهُ مَسْئُورًا XVII. 38. *Verily the ear and the eye and the heart, all of those are inquired about* (J), and similarly

يَا مَا اَمِيلُ غَزَلَانَا شَدَنَّا لَنَا  
مِنْ هَوًى لِيَاكُنِ الضَّالِّ وَالسَّوَرِ

(IY), by ‘Abd Allāh [Ibn ‘Umar (ID)] Ibn ‘Annr Ibn ‘Uthmān Ibn ‘Affān al‘Arjī, *O how graceful* [288] *are*

young gazelles whose horns have budded for us from among those herds of gazelles that graze amidst those little [293] wild lote trees and gum-acacia trees! (Jsh), though it is mostly used for the rational, and there is a version <sup>أَقْوَامٌ</sup> *peoples* [in the former verse] (J); and, when pronounced with Kasr, sometimes has Tanwīn [608], in which case, the Tanwīn denoting *indeterminate-ness*, as in <sup>صَا</sup> [187, 198], while <sup>أُولَئِكَ</sup> is *det.*, its import is *distance*, in order that the persons demonstrated may be like the *indet.*, so that <sup>أُولَئِكَ</sup> is like <sup>أُولَئِكَ</sup> [173]; and sometimes has the 1st Hamza changed into *ḥ*, as <sup>هَؤُلَاءِ</sup>, or the last Hamza pronounced with Damm, as <sup>أُولَئِكَ</sup>; and sometimes has the Dammā before the *ل* impleted, as <sup>أُولَئِكَ</sup> upon the measure of <sup>صُومَرٍ</sup>; whereas <sup>هَؤُلَاءِ</sup> upon the measure of <sup>تَوْرَابٍ</sup>, as

تَجَلَّدَ لَا يَقُلْ هَؤُلَاءِ هَذَا \* بَكَى لَمَّا بَكَى اسْفًا وَغَيْظًا

*Bear up: let not these say, This man wept, when he wept, for grief and rage* is not a *dial. var.*, but a contraction of <sup>هَؤُلَاءِ</sup> [174] by elision of the *ḥ* of <sup>هَؤُلَاءِ</sup> and conversion of the [1st] Hamza of <sup>أُولَئِكَ</sup> into *و* (R). The *dem.* in II. 1. [599] is made *masc.*, though the demonstrated is a *fem.*, vid. the *سُورَةُ* chapter, because <sup>الْكِتَابِ</sup> is (1) its *enunc.*, in which case, <sup>ذَلِكَ</sup> having the same

meaning and denominate as <sup>اَلْكِتَابُ</sup>, the gender of the former may be made to accord with that of the latter, as in <sup>مِنْ كَانَتْ اَمْك</sup> [182, 449]: (2) its *ep.*, *That scripture*, in which case only <sup>اَلْكِتَابُ</sup> is plainly demonstrated by it, since by the *dem.* is demonstrated the [*n. of*] genus occurring as its *ep.*: you say <sup>هَذَا ذَاكَ الْاِنْسَانُ فَعَلَ كَذَا</sup> or <sup>ذَاكَ الشَّخْصُ</sup> *Find, that human being, or that person, did such a thing*, and [An Nābigah] adh Dhubyānī says

نَبِئْتُ نَعْمًا عَلَى الْهِجْرَانِ عَاتِبَةً  
سَقِيًّا وَرَعِيًّا لَذَاكَ الْعَانِبِ الْزَارِي

[*I have been told that Nu'm (the beloved) is blaming the desertion: God send down rain to, and keep, that blaming, upbraiding (person)! (N)*]. And <sup>بَيْنِي</sup> [115] may be prefixed to <sup>ذَاكَ</sup> in <sup>ذَاكَ</sup> <sup>بَيْنِي</sup> <sup>ذَاكَ</sup> II. 63. *Middle-aged between those two* because <sup>ذَاكَ</sup> is i. q. two things [172], since it occurs as a *dem.* of the <sup>فَارِضُ</sup> and <sup>بَكْرُ</sup> mentioned [149], being allowable as a *dem.* of two *fems.*, though it is *sing. masc.*, as being a paraphrase of <sup>مَا تَقْدَمُ</sup> or <sup>مَا ذِكْرُ</sup> for the sake of abridgment. And the *pron.* is sometimes treated like the *dem.* in this respect: AU says, I said to Ru'ba about his saying <sup>فِيهَا خُطُوطُ الْخ</sup>

[161] "If thou mean the <sup>حُطُوط</sup>, say <sup>كَانَهَا</sup>, and, if the <sup>سَوَاد</sup> and <sup>بَلَق</sup>, say <sup>كَانَهُمَا</sup>"; and he said, "I meant <sup>كَانَ</sup> ذَاكَ" (K). The *dems.* [except <sup>ذَاكَ</sup> and <sup>ذِي</sup> (Sh)] are

*uninfl.* (IY, R, Sh), upon quiescence, like <sup>ذَا</sup> and <sup>ذِي</sup>; Fath, like <sup>ثُمَّ</sup> [175], as <sup>رَأَيْتُمَا</sup> <sup>ثُمَّ</sup> <sup>الْأَخْرَبِي</sup> XXVI. 64. And *We made the others draw near there*; Kasr, like <sup>هَؤُلَاءِ</sup>; and Damm, like <sup>هَؤُلَاءِ</sup>. which Kth relates that some of the Arabs say (Sh): (1) according to most (R), because they imply the sense of the *p.* (IY, R), *vid. demonstration*: for, this being a meaning, like *interrogation*, a *p.* ought to be constituted to indicate it [159], because their custom current in the case of every meaning introduced into the sentence or into words after their formation is that a *p.* should be constituted to indicate it, like the [*ps.* of] *interrogation* in <sup>أَضَارِبَ</sup> <sup>زَيْدٍ</sup> and <sup>ذَلَّ</sup> <sup>زَيْدٍ</sup>, *negation* in <sup>مَا</sup> <sup>ضَرَبَ</sup> <sup>عَمْرُو</sup>, *wish, hope, beginning, ending, premonition, comparison, etc.*, for which <sup>لَيْتَ</sup>, <sup>لَعَلَّ</sup>, <sup>مِنْ</sup>, <sup>أَلَى</sup>, <sup>هَآ</sup>, the <sup>ك</sup>, etc. are constituted; or that what follows the course of the *p* in needing something else should be constituted to denote it, like the inflection indicative of the various meanings, the <sup>ي</sup> of relation, and the alteration of the formation alone, as in <sup>غُرْفَةً</sup> and <sup>غُرْفَ</sup> and <sup>كُسْرًا</sup> and <sup>كُسْرَ</sup>, or with the addition of a letter, as in the *dim.* and some broken

*pls.*: and, 'since *demonstration* is a meaning introduced into words like <sup>الرجل</sup> <sup>الفرس</sup> in <sup>هذا</sup> <sup>الرجل</sup> *This man* and <sup>الفرس</sup> <sup>ذاك</sup> *That horse*, and no *p.* has been constituted to indicate it, the *dems.* become like impliers of the sense of the *p.* (R): (2) as some say, because the *dem.* resembles the *pron.*: for you demonstrate by the former what is in your presence so long as it remains present, and, when it is absent, that *n.* quits it, whereas [explicit] *ns.* are so constituted as to be inseparable from their denominates; and, since this *n.* is separable from what it is constituted for, it becomes like the *pron.*, which, being used as a *n.* when an explicit *n.* precedes [160], and not having been a *n.* for it before that, is a *n.* for the denominate in one state, and not in another: so that, since the *pron.* must be *uninfl.* [161], the vague [262] must likewise be *uninfl.* (IV): (3) as is said, because the constitution of some *dems.*, as <sup>ذَا</sup>, <sup>تَا</sup>, <sup>ذِي</sup>, and <sup>تِي</sup>, is [*bil.*] like that of *ps.*; while the remainder, as <sup>أُولَئِكَ</sup> and <sup>أُولَئِكَ</sup>, are made to accord with them: (4) as is said, because they need the context that removes their vagueness, vid. either sensible demonstration or qualification [148]. as <sup>الرجل</sup> <sup>هذا</sup> *This man*, as the *p.* needs something else [497]. The majority say that the *du.* is *uninfl.*, because the cause of uninflectedness exists in it, as in the *sing.* and *pl.*; and that <sup>ذَانِ</sup> is a coined form, not constructed upon a *sing.*, <sup>ذَانِ</sup> being a form for the *nom.*, and <sup>ذَيْنِ</sup>

for the *acc.* and *gen.*: but some say that it is *infl.*, because its termination varies with the variation of the *ops.*, while the assertion that each of them is a fresh form is contrary to the apparent [case]. And the dispute on <sup>الَّذَانِ</sup> and <sup>الَّذَيْنِ</sup> [176] is the same as on <sup>ذَانِ</sup> and <sup>ذَيْنِ</sup> (R). The *dems.* <sup>ذَانِ</sup> and <sup>تَانِ</sup> and the conjuncts <sup>الَّذَانِ</sup> and <sup>الَّتَانِ</sup> are like the *du.*, i. e. are *infl.* with the **ا** in the *nom.* and with the **ي** preceded by **ف**ath in the *acc.* and *gen.* [16]. like <sup>الزَّيْدَانِ</sup> and <sup>الرَّحْلَانِ</sup> : but are not really *dus.*, because the only *dets.* that may be dualized are such as are susceptible of being made *indet.*, like <sup>زَيْدٌ</sup> and <sup>عَمْرُو</sup>, which, when held to be common and *indet.* [12], may be dualized, for which reason you say <sup>الزَّيْدَانِ</sup> and <sup>العَمْرَانِ</sup>, prefixing the *p.* of determination to them [13], whereas, if they retained the determination of the quality of proper name, the *p.* of determination might not be prefixed to them; while, <sup>ذَا</sup> and <sup>الَّذِي</sup> not being susceptible of being made *indet.*, because their determination is by means of demonstration and the *conj.*, which are inseparable from them, that proves <sup>ذَانِ</sup>, <sup>الَّذَانِ</sup>, and the like to be *quasi-du. ns.*, like <sup>هُمَا</sup> and <sup>أَنْتَما</sup>, not really *dus.*, for which reason <sup>أَلْ</sup> may not be prefixed to <sup>ذَانِ</sup>, as it may not be to <sup>هُمَا</sup> and <sup>أَنْتَما</sup> (Sh).



But *ذَانِ*, *تَانِ*, *الَّذَانِ*, and *الَّتَانِ* [176] occur in the three cases; and to this is attributed XX. 66. [above] (R). These *ns.* are said to be vague [262] because you demonstrate by them everything that is in your presence, and sometimes there are several things in your presence, so that they confuse the person addressed, who does not know which of them you demonstrate; and therefore these *ns.*, being vague, are for that reason invariably explained by the *ep.* upon the occasion of confusion (IY).

§ 172. The *p.* [ *ك* (IY, Sh, Jm)] of allocution [560] is affixed to them (M, III, Sh), to give warning of the number and gender of the person addressed (Jm), as *ذَاكَ*, [ *ذَاكَ* or ] *ذَاكَ* with the *ن* single or double [173], whence *فَذَانِكَ بُرْهَانَاكِ مِنْ رَبِّكَ* XXVIII. 32. *Then those two shall be two proofs from thy Lord,* *ذِيكَ* [below], [but not (IY)] *تَاكَ*, *تِيكَ*, *ذِيكَ*, *تَاكَ*, *تِيكَ*, *أُولَاكَ*, and *أُولَاكَ* (M). The *ك* is not a *pron.*, as in *غَلَامِكَ*, because that would necessarily involve its being governed in the *gen.* by prothesis, which is not allowable, because the *dems.* are not *pre.*, since they are invariably *det.* [112] (Sh). The *ك* of *ذِيكَ* [173] does not indicate the 2nd *pers.* [160], but only allocution; so that it is a *p.* indicating a meaning, but

having absolutely no indication of the person (Sh on the *prons.*). It varies with the gender and number of the person addressed, as كَذَلِكَ قَالَ رَبُّكَ XIX. 10. *Thus hath thy Lord said*, [XIX. 21. (561) (IY),] XII. 37. [561]. <sup>اَوَّلُ صُلُوْبِهِ</sup> ذَاكُمُ اللّٰهُ رَبُّكُمْ VI. 102. *That is God your Lord*, and XII. 32. [502] (M). These [*ps* of allocution (Jm)] being five [multiplied (Jm)] into five [sorts of *dem.*, i. e. the *sing. masc.* and *fem.*, the *du. masc.* and *fem.*, and the common *pl.* (Jm)], that [product (Jm)] is 25, vid. ذَاكَ to ذَاكَ [and ذَيْنِكَ (Jm)] to ذَانِكَ [and ذَيْنِكُمْ (Jm)], and similarly the rest (IH), i. e. تَاكَ and تَانِكَ to تَيْنِكَ and تَيْنِكُمْ, تَاكَ to تَاكَ and تَيْنِكُمْ, and تَاكَ to تَاكَ and تَيْنِكُمْ; while ذَيْنِكَ, though given by Z [above] and MK, is said in the [Th and] Sihāḥ to be wrong (Jm). But there is another *dial.*, transmitted by trustworthy authorities, which makes the sign of allocution *sing.* and pronounces it with Fath in every case, by giving predominance to the side of the *sing. masc.*, as وَكَذَلِكَ جَعَلْنَاكُمْ أُمَّةً وَسَطًا II. 137. *And thus have We made you a chosen people*, where the analogy of the 1st *dial.* requires وَكَذَلِكَ, because the address is to a multitude, as in the other text لَنْ تَتَّبِعُونَا لَنْ تَتَّبِعُونَا كَذَلِكَ قَالَ اللّٰهُ مِنْ قَبْلِ

us. Thus hath God said before ; and hence يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أَنْ تَنْصُرُوا اللَّهَ يَنْصُرَكُمْ.....ذَلِكَ بَأْنَهُمْ XLVII. 8-10.

O ye that have belived, if ye help God, He will help you.....That is because they, not ذَلِكَ, though the addressed is a multitude (IY). And [thus] ذَلِكَ is some-

times used in place of ذَلِكَ, as ذَلِكَ لِمَنْ خَشِيَ الْعَنَتَ IV. 30. That marrying of the handmaidens is for

him of you that dreading falling into fornication and ذَلِكَ أَدْنَى أَنْ لَا تُعْوَلُوا IV. 3. That choice of one wife will be nearer to the condition that ye be not unfair; just

as the sing. is sometimes used to demonstrate two [things], as II. 63. [171], or more, as كُلُّ ذَلِكَ كَانَ سَيِّئَةً

XVII. 40. All of those, the evil thereof are hateful in the sight of thy Lord, by paraphrasing the du. or pl. by الْمَذْكُورَ (R).

§ 173. The ل [599, 681] before the ك is optional, as ذَاكَ or ذَلِكْ (Sh). ذَلِكَ is ذَاكَ with the ل added in it [to indicate the distance of the demonstrated, and pronounced with Kasr because of the concurrence of two quiescents (IY)]. A distinction being made between ذَا, ذَاكَ, and ذَلِكْ (M), ذَا is said to denote the near, ذَاكَ the intermediate, and ذَلِكْ the distant. [But some,

holding that there is no medium between the *near* and *distant*, say that the *dems.* denuded of the **ل** and **ك** denote the *near*; and that those conjoined with them, or with the **ك** alone, denote the *distant* (R).] And like [the *masc.* (IY)] ذَلِكْ [in importing *distance* (Jm)] are [the *fem.* (M, R)] تِلْكَ (M, IH) from تِي, in which they elide the ي because of its quiescence and the quiescence of the ل after it (IY), تِلْكَ, تِيْلِكْ with Fath of the ت by elision of the ا of ت (R), and تَالِكْ [from تُ, in which they do not elide the ا, as they do not elide it in ذَلِكْ (IY)], the last [3 (R)] being rare (M, R); the *du.* (R) ذَانِكَ and تَانِكَ; and [the *pl.* (R)] اُولَئِكَ (IH) and اُولَآءِ [171] (R). The reduplication of the ن [in ذَانِي and هَذَانِي is a compensation for an elided letter, the ا of ذَا; but (IY)] in ذَانِكَ [and تَانِكَ (R)], says Mb, is a compensation for the ل in ذَلِكْ (IY, R) and تَالِكَ (R): so that, when you say ذَاكَ in the *sing.*, you say ذَانِكَ in the *du.* (IY); while, according to Mb, ذَانِكَ is the *du.* of ذَلِكْ (M). But others than Mb say that the reduplication is a compensation for the elided ا of the *sing.* [ ذَاكَ and تَاكَ ] :

and this is more likely, because they say **الَّذَانِ** and **الَّتَانِ** with the **ن** doubled as a compensation for the elided **ي** [176]; while, if the reduplication were a compensation for the **ل**, **هَذَانِ** with **هَآ** [174] would not be said, as **هَٰذَلِكَ** is not said: so that, according to others than Mb and his followers, the *distant* and *intermediate* have one expression in the *du.* (R). The **ل** must be omitted in (1) the *dem.* of the *du.*, as **ذَانِكَ** and **تَانِكَ**: (2) the *dem.* of the *pl.* in the *dial.* of those who prolong it, as **أُولَئِكَ**; whereas, if you abbreviate, you say **أُولَاكَ** or **أُولَاكَ**: (3) every *dem.* preceded by the premonitory *p.*, as **هَٰذَاكَ** [174], **هَٰتَاكَ**, and **هَٰتَيْكَ** (Sh). And Fr asserts that omission of the **ل** in all is the *dial.* of Tamīm, who content themselves with the **ك** alone to denote the *distant* and *intermediate* (R).

§ 174. The premonitory [*p.* (IH) **هَآ** (M, R)] is prefixed to them [552] (M, IH). One says [*sing. masc.* (Sh)] **هَٰذَا**, [the **ا** of **هَآ** being dropped in writing from frequency of usage, but retained in pronunciation (IY); *fem.* (Sh) **هَٰذِهِ** (IY, Sh), **هَٰتِهِ** (IY), **هَٰذِي** (M),] **هَٰتَا**, and **هَٰتَيْ**, [as

وخبّرتماني إنما الموت بالقري  
فكيف وهاتي هضبة وكثيب

{by Ka'b alGhanawī, *And ye two told me that death was only in the towns: then how (did my brother die in this place), when this is a rock and a sand-heap?*

(N),} and وَلَيْسَ لِعَيْشِنَا آخٌ (149) (IY): *du.* (IY, Sh) *masc.*, in the *nom.* (Sh) هَذَانِ, [and in the *acc.* and *gen.* هَذَيْنِ; *fem.*, in the *nom.* (Sh) هَاتَانِ, {and in the *acc.* and *gen.* هَاتَيْنِ (Sh)}: *pl.* (IY, Sh), *masc.* and *fem.* (Sh) هُوَلَاءُ (M, Sh) or هُوَلَا (M), with prolongation [in the *dial.* of the Hijāzis, which is transmitted in the Kur'ān (Sh),] or abbreviation (IY, Sh) in the *dial.* of the Banū Tamīm (Sh), and هُوَلَا [or هُوَلَا] with elision of the ه of هَا, as [171] and

هُوَلَا ثُمَّ هُوَلَا نِكَ اعْطِيَتْ نِعَالًا مَحْذُورَةً بِنِعَالٍ

by ALA'shà, *To these, then those, did I give sandals measured by sandals* (IY). And [sometimes the *p.* of allocution is with them, as (IY)] هَاتَاكَ, [ (IY), هَاتَاكَ, هَاتَانِكَ, هَاتَانِكَ, هَاتَانِكَ (M), هَاتَانِكَ (IY). The هَا is not part of the *dem.*, but only a *p.* put to call the attention of the person addressed to the demonstrated, as is proved by its ellipse, allowably in ذَا and

ذَاكَ, and necessarily in ذَلِك [173] (Sh). One explanation of XX. 66. [16, 171] is that, when هَذَا is dualized, two *h* s, the *h* of هَذَا and the *h* of dualization, are combined, so that one of them must be elided, because of the concurrence of two quiescents; and therefore those who assume the elided to be the *h* of هَذَا, and the remaining one to be the *h* of dualization, convert the latter into *ya* in the *acc.* and *gen.* [16]; but those who assume the converse do not alter the *h* [171] (Sh on inflection).

§ 175. And hence their saying, when they demonstrate the *near place*, هُنَا; and, when the *distant*, هُنَا, for which [هُنَا, with (IY)] Kasr [of the *h*, a vicious and rare *dial. var.* (IY),] has been transmitted, and ثُمَّ (M): these *ns.* also being *dems.*, like هَذَا and هُوَذَا, except that by these *ns.* only that *place* which is present, and by those *everything*, is demonstrated. And Dhur-Kumma says

هَنَا وَهَنَا وَمِنْ هَنَا لَهِنَّ بِهَا \* ذَاتَ الشَّامِلِ وَالْإِيحَانِ هَيْنُومِ  
[There (an *adv.* to زَجَلَ in the preceding saying لِلْجِنِّ  
بِالْإِيلِ فِي أَرْجَائِنَا زَجَلَ The Jinn have at night on our  
sides a clamouring), and there, and here (مِنْ being *red.*)  
or there: they (the Jinn) have on them (the sides), on the

*left hands and on the right hands a muttering, with Fath of the 8 in all three, or, as is said, with Fath of the 8 in the 1st, Kasr in the 2nd, and Damm in the 3rd, and (FA)] with reduplication [of the ن in all three (FA)]; but, as for the saying of the Rājiz*

قَدْ وَرَدَتْ مِنِّي امْكِنَةٌ  
مِنْ هَاهُنَا وَمِنْ هُنَا  
أَنْ لَمْ أَزَوْهَا فَمَهْ

[*They (the camels) have come to water from many places, from here and from here: if I quench not their thirst, what (am I to do)? (AAz)*], he means هُنَا, and substitutes a 8 for the 1 [181, 690] (IY). هُنَا is invariably an *adv.*, either in the *acc.* or governed in the *gen.* by مِنْ or إِلَى only (R). ثُمَّ is a *n.* whereby *distant place* is demonstrated, as XXVI. 64. [171]: and it [also] is an *aplastic* [64] *adv.* [of *place*, i. e. is not used except as an *adv.*, nor governed in the *gen.* except by مِنْ (DM)]; for which reason he that parses it as [direct (DM)] *obj.* of رَأَيْتَ in رَأَيْتَ ثُمَّ رَأَيْتَ makes a blunder, [رَأَيْتَ having no *obj.* expressed or supplied, in order that it may be general, and ثُمَّ being in the position of the *acc.* as an *adv.*, i. e. in *Paradise* (K)]: and it is not preceded by the premonitory *p.* [552],



nor followed by the ك of allocation [560] (ML). The ك [of allocation (M)] is affixed, [and the premonitory p. is prefixed (M),] to [هنا and (M)] ههنا (M, R), as ههناك, هاهنا, and هاهنا, e. g. انا هاهنا قاعدون V. 27. *Verily we stop here* (IY); but not to ثم, the saying ثمك being wrong (R): and [they put the ل, so that (IY)] هنالك [599, 681] is said, as ذاك [173] is said (M), e. g. XVIII. 42. [75] (IY). هنا denotes the *near*, هناك the *intermediate*, and هنالك the *distant*: while ههنا, ههنا, and ههنا, like هنالك, denote the *distant*. But sometimes *time* is meant by هناك, هنالك, and هنا, as XVIII. 42. [75], i. e. حينئذ Then, and حنت هنا [109], i. e. ولات حين حنت when (the longing was) not at a time that etc, هنا being an *adv.* of *time*, because of its prefixion to the *prop.* [124] (R). IHsh, however, says that the *dem.* is not *pre.* (SM); and the best is the saying of F that لات is *inop.*, [the *adv.*] هنا a *prepos. enunc.*, and حنت a *postpos. inch.* by subaudition of ان, as in [ومن آياته يريكم البرق] XXX. 23. And among His signs is (that) He showeth you the lightning and (SM) [تسمع بالمعيسى] [2, 418. A.] (ML), i. e. وليس كائننا في هذا الوقت الحنين هنا (DM).

## THE CONJUNCTS.

§. 176. They are (1) [ <sup>الَّذِي</sup> and <sup>الَّتِي</sup> and their *du.* and *pl.* (IY),] (a) *sing., masc.* <sup>الَّذِي</sup>, [used for the rational and irrational (IY, Sh), as XXXIX. 34. (178) and <sup>هَذَا يَوْمَكُمْ الَّذِي كُنْتُمْ تَوَعَدُونَ</sup> XXI. 103. *This is your day, which ye used to be promised* (Sh)]; *fem.* <sup>الَّتِي</sup>, [used for the rational and irrational, as LVIII. 1. (575) and <sup>سَيَقُولُ السُّفَهَاءُ مِنَ النَّاسِ مَا وَلَّاهُمْ عَنْ قِبَلَتِهِمُ الَّتِي</sup> and <sup>كَانُوا عَلَيْهَا</sup> II. 136. *The foolish of the people continually (578) say, What hath turned them away from their Kibla that they were determined upon?* (Sh): (a) sometimes the <sup>ي</sup> of <sup>الَّذِي</sup> {and <sup>الَّتِي</sup> (IY, R, Sh)} is (α) doubled (M, R, Sh), as <sup>الَّذِي</sup> and <sup>الَّتِي</sup> (IY, R), the two words being then *infl.* {like <sup>أَي</sup> according to Jz, (R)}, or *uninfl.* upon Kasr (R, Sh) according to some, as

وَلَيْسَ أَعْمَالُ فَاعِلَةٍ بِأَعْمَالٍ \* وَإِنْ أَغْنَاكَ إِلَّا لِلَّذِي  
يُنَالُ بِهِ الْعُلَا \* وَيَصْطَفِيكَ \* لِأَقْرَبِ أَقْرَبِيَّةٍ وَلِصَفِيٍّ

*And wealth is not (then know thou it) wealth, even if it enrich thee, except for him that obtains by it eminence, and devotes it to the nearest of his kindred and to the friend* (R); (β) elided, the preceding letter being then

pronounced with Kasr, {as it was before the elision (Sh),} or quiescent (IY, R, Sh), as

وَالَّذِي لَوْ شَاءَ لَكُنْتَ صَخْرًا \* أَوْ جَبَلًا أَوْ أَسَمًا مَشْمُورًا

*By Him Who is such that, if He willed, I should be a rock or a mountain solid, high,*

وَلَا تَكُونِي مِنَ الَّذِينَ كَانُوا تَزِي زَبِيَّةً فَاصْطِيدًا

*And be sure thou be not of them that have been outwitted, like him that has dug a pitfall, and been caught in it himself, and*

فَقُلْ لِّلَّتْ تَلَوْمُكَ إِنَّ نَفْسِي \* أَرَاهَا لَا تَعُونُ بِالْتَّمِيمِ

*Then say thou to her that blames thee, Verily my soul, I know it charms not with amulets (R): (b) the ة and*

ل in اَلَّذِي and اَلَّتِي and their *du.* and *pl.* are, according to critical judges, *red.* (599), what is intended by them being the form of determination, not its sense, as is proved by two matters, ( $\alpha$ ) that the ة and ل in the conjuncts are an inseparable addition; whereas the ل of determination is not known by us to occur inseparably,

but on the contrary may be dropped, as اَلْغَلَامُ and غُلَامٌ; while we do not find them say كُنْ, as they say كُنْ: ( $\beta$ ) that we find many of the conjunct *ns.* to be

denuded of the ة and ل, but, notwithstanding that, to be *det.*, vid. مَنِ, مَا, and اِي, their determinateness being only by means of the *conj.*s. after them; and, when

it is established that the *conj.* is determinative, the and **ج** in such conjuncts as they are prefixed to are not determinative also, because the *n.* does not become *det.* for two different reasons: (c) the **ا** and **ج** are added for a sort of rectification of the form, because **الَّذِي** and such of its sisters as contain a **ج** are introduced only as connectives to the qualification of *dets.* by *props.* (178): for *props.* are *indet.* (144), and the *indet.* is not an *ep.* of the *det.* (146); while it is impossible to prefix the **ج** of determination to the *prop.*, because this **ج** is one of the peculiarities of *ns.* (2), whereas the *prop.* is not peculiar to *ns.*, but is nominal and verbal: so that they then put **الَّذِي**, and make the *prop.* a *conj.* to **الَّذِي**, which is the *ep.* in form, though the object is the *prop.*; and, the form of **الَّذِي** before the prefixion of the **ا** and **ج** not being in accordance with the form of the *eps.* of *dets.*, they add at its beginning the **ا** and **ج**, in order that they may thereby obtain the form of the *det.*, which they intend, and thus the form and sense may correspond (IY): (b) *du., masc.*, [in the *nom.* (IY, IA, Sh)] **الَّذَانِ**, [and in the *acc.* and *gen.* **الَّذَيْنِ** (IY, IA, Sh)]; *fem.*, [in the *nom.* (IY, IA, Sh)] **الَّتَانِ**, [and in the *acc.* and *gen.* **الَّتَيْنِ** (IY, IA, Sh): the **ي** being elided in the *du.* (IY, R, IA); and replaced by the **ا** in the *nom.*, and by the **ي** in the *acc.* and *gen.* (IA)]: (a)

sometime the  $\text{ذ}$  is ( $\alpha$ ) doubled, [as a compensation for the elided  $\text{ذ}$  (173) (R, IA), as in the reading {of Ibn Kathir (IY)}  $\text{وَالَّذَانِ يَأْتِيَانِيَا مِنْكُمْ}$  IV. 20 *And the two of you that shall commit it* (IY, IA) and the reading  $\text{رَبَّنَا اِزِنَا لِلَّذَيْنِ}$  XII. 29. *Our Lord, show Thou us the two that*; and this reduplication is allowable in the *du.* of the *dems.*  $\text{ذَا}$  and  $\text{تَا}$  also, as  $\text{ذَانِ}$ ,  $\text{تَانِ}$ ,  $\text{ذَيْنِ}$ , and  $\text{تَيْنِ}$ , being intended as a compensation for the elided  $\text{ذ}$  (IA): ( $\beta$ ) elided (R, Sh), because the conjunct is deemed too long by reason of its *conj.*, as  $\text{اِبْنِي كَلَيْبٍ}$   $\text{الْخ}$  (178) and

$\text{هُمَا اللَّتَا لَوْ وَلَدَتْ تَمِيمٌ * لَقِيلَ فَخَرْنَاكُمْ صَمِيمٌ}$

{by AlAkhtal, *They two are those two women who are such that, if Tamīm had given them birth, it would have been said, Theirs is genuine glory!* (Jsh)}: (b) the *dus.* are *infl.* or *uninfl.*, according to the different opinions on  $\text{ذَانِ}$  and  $\text{تَانِ}$  (171); and  $\text{الَّذَانِ}$  and  $\text{الَّتَانِ}$  occur in the three cases in some unchaste *dials.*; but, when they vary, it is better to say that they are *infl.* (R)]: (c) *pl., masc.*  $\text{الَّذَيْنِ}$ , [for the rational (R, IA), in the three cases (IY, R, IA, Sh)]; and [in some *dials.* (M)]  $\text{الَّذَوْنِ}$  [in the *nom.* (IY, R, IA, Sh), the *dial.* of Hudhail (R, IA), or, as some say, ‘Uḡail (J), whence

نَحْنُ اللَّذُونَ صَبَحُوا الصَّبَاحَ \* يَوْمَ الذُّخَيْلِ غَارَةً مُلْحَا

(IA), by Abū Harb AlA'lam alJāhili al'Ukāili, *We are they that came in the morning on the day of AnNukhail* (a place in Syria) *for an obstinate onslaught* (Jsh), *اللَّذُونَ* being written with two ل s, and *الَّذِينَ* with one, because *ال*, being a determinative or in the semblance thereof, whereas the determinative is not prefixed to the *p.* nor to the *uninfls.* like it, is elided in writing, contrary to the *infl.* (DM), and *الَّذِينَ* in the *acc.* and *gen.* (IY, IA), the inflection of the *pl.* being, says Z, the *dial.* of those who double the ي in the *sing.*, which confirms the saying of Jz that *الَّذِي* is *infl.*, so that *اللَّذُونَ* is *orig.* *الَّذِينَ*, and, one of the two ي s having been elided, is afterwards treated like *قَاضُونَ*; while some transmit *الَّذِينَ* in the *nom.* and *الَّذِينَ* in the *acc.* and *gen.*, which is the *dial.* of those who double the ي, and then pluralize *الَّذِي* without elision of anything; and sometimes the ن is elided from *اللَّذُونَ* for alleviation, as

قَوْمِي اللَّذَوِ بَعَاظُ طَيْرُوا شَرًّا

مِنْ رُؤْسِي قَوْمِكَ ضَرْبًا بِالْمَتَّاقِيلِ

*My people are they that at 'Ukāz made sparks fly from the heads of thy people, smiting with the weights, and from اَلَّذِيْنَ also, as دَانِ اَلَّذِيْ حَانَتْ اَلْخَ (117, 178) (R)]; and اَلَّذِيْ [or اَلَّذِيْ (FA), i. q. اَلَّذِيْ (IY, FA), a heteromorphous pl. of اَلَّذِيْ (IY, R), upon the measure of اَلْعَلَى (R), pronounced with abbreviation or prolongation (Sh), used for the rational and irrational, and sometimes for the pl. fem., both matters being combined in*

وَتَبَلَىٰ اَلَاٰلِیَ یَسْتَلْتُمُوْنَ عَلٰی اَلَاٰلِیَ

تَوَاهِنِ یَوْمِ الرُّوْعِ کَالْحِدْدِ الْقَبْلِ

(IA), by Abū Dhu'aib alHudhalī, *And it* (relating to *Fate* in the preceding verse) *consumes those heroes who put on coats of mail when purposing to mount upon those mares which thou wilt know on the day of battle to be like squint-eyed kites in swiftness* (J); and اَللَّائِیْنَ

in the *nom.*, *acc.*, and *gen.*; and, the ن being elided,

اَللَّائِیَ, like اَلْقَاضِیَ, which is rare in the *masc.*, as

اَللَّائِیَ یُؤْلَوْنَ مِنْ نِسَائِهِمْ II. 226. *For them that swear to abstain from their wives*, so read by Akh (R); and اَللَّائِیَ

(R, IA), by elision of the ی (R), as

فَمَا اَبَاؤُنَا بِاَمْنٍ مِّدَّةٍ \* عَلَيْنَا اَللَّائِیَ قَدْ مَهَّدُوا الْحَجَّوْرَا

(IA) *Then our fathers, who have spread out the bosoms*  
of their garments as cradles for us, *are not kinder to us*  
*than he* (J); and <sup>اَللّٰهُنَّ</sup> *اَللّٰهُنَّ* in the *nom.*, and <sup>اَللّٰهُنَّ</sup> *اَللّٰهُنَّ* in the  
*acc.* and *gen.* (M, R), *perf. pl.* of <sup>اَللّٰهُ</sup> *اَللّٰهُ* i. q. <sup>اَلَّذِي</sup> *اَلَّذِي*, as  
<sup>اَلَّذِي</sup> *اَلَّذِي* فعل , i. e. <sup>اَلَّذِي</sup> *اَلَّذِي* فعل ]: *fem.* <sup>اَللّٰتِي</sup> *اَللّٰتِي*,  
[upon the measure of <sup>فَاعِل</sup> *فَاعِل* from <sup>اَلَّتِي</sup> *اَلَّتِي*, a *quasi-pl. n.*, like  
<sup>اَلْبَاقِرُ</sup> *اَلْبَاقِرُ* and <sup>اَلْجَامِلُ</sup> *اَلْجَامِلُ* (257) (R)]; and <sup>اَللّٰتِي</sup> *اَللّٰتِي*, [with Hamza  
in place of the *ت*, which is frequent in the *pl.* of <sup>اَلَّتِي</sup> *اَلَّتِي*,  
but not in the *pl.* of <sup>اَلَّذِي</sup> *اَلَّذِي* (R); and <sup>اَللّٰوَاتِي</sup> *اَللّٰوَاتِي* (M, R) and  
<sup>اَللّٰوَاتِي</sup> *اَللّٰوَاتِي* (IY, R), as though they were *pls.* of the *pl.* (R)];  
and <sup>اَللّٰتِ</sup> *اَللّٰتِ*, <sup>اَللّٰوَاتِ</sup> *اَللّٰوَاتِ*, [ <sup>اَللّٰوَاتِ</sup> *اَللّٰوَاتِ*, and <sup>اَللّٰوَاتِ</sup> *اَللّٰوَاتِ* (IY, R), by elision  
of the *ي* (R, IA, Sh) in all four (R), as in LXV. 4.  
(29) (IY, Sh), which is read with or without the *ي*,  
while <sup>اَللّٰتِي</sup> *اَللّٰتِي* <sup>يَاتِيْنِ</sup> *يَاتِيْنِ* <sup>اَلْفَاحِشَةُ</sup> *اَلْفَاحِشَةُ* IV. 19. *And those who shall*  
*commit adultery* is read among the Seven only with the  
*ي*, because it is lighter than <sup>اَللّٰتِي</sup> *اَللّٰتِي*, as being without a  
Hamza (Sh); and <sup>اَللّٰتِي</sup> *اَللّٰتِي* (M, R), the Hamza of <sup>اَللّٰتِي</sup> *اَللّٰتِي* being  
lightened between Hamza and *ي* (658), because it is  
pronounced with Kasr, as in the reading of Warsh  
<sup>اَللّٰتِي</sup> *اَللّٰتِي* <sup>يُتَسَنَّنُ</sup> *يُتَسَنَّنُ* LXV. 4.; and <sup>اَللّٰتِي</sup> *اَللّٰتِي* with a quiescent *ي*  
after the *ل* without a Hamza, as in the reading of Abù  
‘Amr and Bz (610), which, says Abù ‘Amr, is the *dial.*



of Kuraish; and <sup>اللَّوَا</sup>, by elision of the <sup>ت</sup> and <sup>ي</sup> together; and <sup>الْأَعَات</sup>, like <sup>الْأَعَات</sup>, having the <sup>ت</sup> pronounced with Kasr, or *infl.* like <sup>المسلمات</sup>; and <sup>الْأَلَى</sup>, a heteromorphous *pl.* of <sup>الَّتَى</sup> also, <sup>الْأَلَى</sup> and <sup>الْأَلَى</sup> being common to <sup>الَّذَى</sup> and <sup>الَّتَى</sup>, except that <sup>الْأَلَى</sup> is better known in the *pl.* of the *masc.*, while <sup>الْأَلَى</sup> is the reverse of it (R): (2) [common to all genders and numbers (R, IA, Sh),] (a) <sup>أَل</sup>, [denoting the rational and irrational (IA), prefixed to the *act.* and *pass. parts.* (R, Sh), as <sup>الضَّارِبُ</sup> and <sup>المضروبُ</sup> (177) (Sh), and held by Z to be a defective form of <sup>الَّذَى</sup>, etc. (178), but properly not the <sup>ل</sup> of <sup>الَّذَى</sup>, because the <sup>ل</sup> of <sup>الَّذَى</sup> is *red.*, contrary to the conjunct <sup>ل</sup> (R): (b) <sup>مَا</sup> [180]: (c) <sup>مَنْ</sup> [182]: (d) <sup>أَي</sup>, [*pre.* to a *det.* (116), in order that it may be *det.* (262) (R), as XIX. 70. (184) (Sh), the prefixion being either expressed or constructive: (a) <sup>أَي</sup>, when the *fem.* is meant by it, may have the <sup>ة</sup> affixed to it, whether it be conjunct, *interrog.*, or otherwise, as <sup>لَقِيتُ إِيَّهَا لَقِيتُ</sup> or <sup>إِيَّهَا لَقِيتُ</sup> *I met her of them that thou didst meet*; though An says that feminization is anomalous in it, as it is in <sup>كَلَّتْهُنَّ</sup> {*fem.* of <sup>كَلَّ</sup> (K, B on XXXI. 34.)}, <sup>خَيْرَةٌ</sup>

شَرَّةُ النَّاسِ and النَّاسِ, some of the Arabs dualize and pluralize it also, in interrogation and elsewhere, as أَيَاهُمْ <sup>أَيَاهُمْ</sup> Which two of them are thy two brothers? and أَيُوهُم أَخوتك <sup>أَيُوهُم أَخوتك</sup> Which of them are thy brothers?; which are more anomalous than the femininization, but are made allowable by its plasticity in inflection (R)]: (e) the Tā'ī <sup>تَايِي</sup>, [denoting the rational and irrational (IA), as لَنْ لَمْ تَغْيِرْ بَعْضَ مَا قَدْ صَنَعْتُمْ \* لَأَنْتَحِينَ لِلْعَظَمِ ذُو أَنَا عَارِقَةٌ <sup>لَنْ لَمْ تَغْيِرْ بَعْضَ مَا قَدْ صَنَعْتُمْ \* لَأَنْتَحِينَ لِلْعَظَمِ ذُو أَنَا عَارِقَةٌ</sup> by 'Ārik (M) at Tā'ī, (I swear,) if thou alter not some of what you have done, assuredly I will have recourse to breaking the bone, the flesh of which I am gnawing (T), which in their {best known (R, IA)} dial. is invariable in gender and number, {as

فَإِنَّ الْمَاءَ مَاءَ أَبِي وَجَدِي \* وَبَيْتِي ذُو حَفَرٍ وَذُو طَوَيْتٍ <sup>فَإِنَّ الْمَاءَ مَاءَ أَبِي وَجَدِي \* وَبَيْتِي ذُو حَفَرٍ وَذُو طَوَيْتٍ</sup>

(IY, R), by Sinān Ibn AlFahl of the Banū Umm AlKahf of Tayyi, *For verily the water is the water of my father and my grandfather, and my well, which I dug, and which I cased* (T), i. e. أَلَّتِي حَفَرْتُهَا (R), and uninfl. also (IY, R, IA), as

فَمَا كَرَامَ مَوْسِرُونَ أَتَيْتَهُمْ \* فَكَسَبِي مِنْ ذُو عِنْدِهِمْ مَا كَفَانِيَا <sup>فَمَا كَرَامَ مَوْسِرُونَ أَتَيْتَهُمْ \* فَكَسَبِي مِنْ ذُو عِنْدِهِمْ مَا كَفَانِيَا</sup>

(below) (IY, IA); while the 2nd dial., transmitted by Jz, has ذُو for the masc. and ذَاتُ for the fem., in the sing., du., and pl.; the 3rd, also transmitted by him, has the

same as the 2nd, except that ذَوَاتُ is said for the *fem. pl.* in the three cases; and in the 4th, transmitted by IDn, it is variable, like ذُو i. q. صَاحِبٌ, and *infl.* with the inflection of all its variations (16) (R)]: (f) ذَا [186] (M, R, IA, Sh). The conjuncts [except الَّذَانِ (171), اللَّتَانِ, and أَيُّ (184) (Sh)] are *uninfl.* (R, Sh), upon quiescence, like الَّذِي, اللَّتِي, مَنْ, and مَا; Fath, like الَّذِينَ; Kasr, like الْأُولَاءِ with prolongation, a *dial. var.* of الْأُولَى i. q. الَّذِينَ, as

أَبَى اللَّهُ لِلشِّمِّ الْأُولَاءِ كَانَهُمْ \* سَيُوفُ أَجَادِ الْقِيَمِ يَوْمًا صَقَالَهَا

[by Kuthayyir, *God has refused to the highminded, who are as though they were swords whose furbishing the smith has done excellently one day* (FA)]; and Damm, like ذَاتُ i. q. اللَّتَى in the *dial.* of some of Tayyi, as Fr relates that he heard a beggar say in the congregational mosque بِالْفَضْلِ ذُو فَضْلِكُمُ اللَّهُ بِهِ وَالْكَرَامَةُ ذَاتُ أَكْرَمِكُمُ اللَّهُ بِهِ *By the excellence that God has made you to excel with, and the honor that God has honored you with,* & with Fath of the ب being *orig.* بِهَا (Sh): either because some of them are constituted like *ps.*, *vid.* مَا, مَنْ, and the ل, while the remainder are made to accord with

them for the sake of uniformity ; or because they need a *conj.* and *rel.* [177] in their completeness as a part [of the *prop.*], as the *p.* needs something else in its quality of part [497]. The inflection ought to rest upon the conjunct [177], because it is the [word] intended by the speech, the *conj.* being put only to explain it ; and the proof is the appearance of the inflection in the conjunct <sup>ء</sup>أى , and similarly in اللّٰهَ and اللّٰهَ according to those who say that they are *infl.* [171]. And some say that the *conj.* is *infl.* with the inflection of the conjunct, because they believe it to be the *ep.* of the conjunct, by reason of its explaining the latter, like the *props.* occurring as *eps.* of *indets.* [1, 144]: but this of no account, because the conjuncts are *dets.* [262] by common consent, and *props.* do not occur as *eps.* of *dets.* ; and the majority hold that the *conj.* has no place in inflection [1], since it is not replaceable by the single term, like [the *prop.* that occurs in the place of] the *ep.*, *enunc.*, *d. s.*, and *post.* [n.] (R). It has reached me that one grammarian used to instruct his pupils to say that the conjunct and its *conj.* were in such and such a position, arguing that they were like one word ; but the truth is what I have premised, [vid. that the *conj.* has no place, and the conjunct has a place, but that their aggregate is not said to have, or not to have a place (DM),] as is proved by the appearance of the inflection in the conjunct itself, as in XLI. 29. [above], the reading <sup>ء</sup>أى <sup>ء</sup>أى XIX. 70. [184] and version <sup>ء</sup>أى <sup>ء</sup>أى

عَلَى أَيُّوْمِ الْخ [184], the saying of the Tā'ī [poet (DM),  
Manzūr Ibn Suhaim (T, DM) alFak'asī (DM),]

فَمَا كَرَامُ مُوسِرُونَ أَتَيْتُهُمْ \* فَحَسْبِي مَن ذِي عِنْدِهِمْ مَا كَفَانِيَا  
[And, if wealthy nobles (be repaired to, if) I come to them,  
my sufficiency of what is with them is what suffices  
me (T)], نَحْنُ الَّذِينَ الْخ [above], and the saying of the  
Hudhailī

هُمْ اللَّائِنُ فَكُرُوا الْغُلَّ عَنِّي \* بِمَرِّ الشَّاهِجَانِ وَهُمْ جُنَاحِي  
(ML) They are those who loosed the yoke from off me in  
Marv Ash-Shāhjān; and they are my strength (Jsh).  
The conjuncts are vague [262], because they are appli-  
cable to every thing, animate, inanimate, etc.; as هَذَا ,  
هُوَ لَاوُ , and the like *dems.* [175] are applicable to every  
thing (IY).

§. 177. The conjunct is what does not become com-  
plete as a part [of the *prop.* (R), i. e. *inch.*, *enunc.*, *ag.*  
(R, Jm), *obj.*, etc. (Jm),] except by means of a *conj.*  
and *rel.* [176]. Its *conj.* [except the *conj.* of اَلْ (R)]  
is an enunciatory *prop.*; [but the place of the *prop.* is  
sometimes supplied by an *adv.* or *prep.* meant to be  
understood as accompanied by a *v.* and *ag.*, the latter of  
which is the *rel.* or the belonging of the *rel.* (R), as  
عَلَى السَّطْحِ غَلَامَةٌ or رَأَيْتُ الذِّي عَلَى السَّطْحِ  
that, or whose manservant, was on the flat roof (MAR)]:

and the *rel.* is a *pron.* [in the *conj.* (R)] belonging to the conjunct (III); but the place of the *rel.* is sometimes, though rarely, supplied by the explicit *n.* (R). The *conj.* is one of four things, (1) the *v* and *ag.*, as جَائِنِي الَّذِي قَامَ *He that stood came to me*: (2) the *inch.* and *enunc.*, in which case you may put the *rel.* with (a) the *inch.* alone, as جَائِنِي الَّذِي أَبُوهُ قَائِمٌ *He whose father is standing came to me*; (b) the *enunc.* alone, as الَّذِي أَخُوكَ غُلَامَةٌ زَيْدٌ *He that thy brother is the manservant of is Zaid*; (c) both of them, as الَّذِي أَبُوهُ أَخُوهُ زَيْدٌ *He whose father is his brother is Zaid*: (3) the *prot.* and *apod.*, in which case you may put the *rel.* in (α) the 1st *prop.*, as جَائِنِي الَّذِي إِنْ تَأْتَيْهِ بِأَتَاكَ عَمْرُو *He that is such that, if thou come to him, 'Amr will come to thee, came to me*; (b) the 2nd *prop.*, as جَائِنِي الَّذِي إِنْ تَكْرُمَ *He that, if thou honor Zaid, will thank thee, came to me*; (c) both of them, as جَائِنِي الَّذِي إِنْ تَزُرَّهُ يَحْسِنَ إِلَيْكَ *He that, if thou visit him, will do good to thee, came to me*, the 1st *rel.* being the *acc.* 8 in تَزُرُّهُ, and the 2nd the *nom. pron.* in يَحْسِنُ: (4) the *adv.* or *prep.* and *gen.*, as جَائِنِي الَّذِي عِنْدَكَ زَيْدٌ *He that is with thee is Zaid* and جَائِنِي الَّذِي فِي الدَّارِ خَالٌ *He that is in the house*

is *Khālid*, in which case the *adv.* [or *prep.* and *gen.*] depends upon a suppressed *v.*, as *حَلَّ*, *اِسْتَقَرَّ*, and the like, not upon an *act. part.*, because the *conj.* is not a single term, but only a *prop.* [67,498] (IY). The *conj.* must be an enunciatory *prop.*, because the purport of the *conj.* must be a predicament whose occurrence is known to the person addressed before the state of address [178], whereas the purport of the originative and requisitive *props.* is not known except after the expression of their formulas; while the saying of the poet

وَإِنِّي لَرَاجٍ نَظْرَةً قَبْلَ الْبَنَى \* لَعَلِّي رَأَيْتُ شَطْرَ نَوَاهَا أَزْوَارَهَا

[*And verily I am hoping for one look at her that, (I say,) perhaps I, even if her destination be far, shall visit,* where *لَعَلِّي أَزْوَارَهَا* is an originative *prop.* (Jsh),] is like

الَّتِي أَقُولُ لَعَلِّي أَزْوَارَهَا [144], i. e. *جَاؤُوا بِمُذْقِ النَّخِ* but the juratory *prop.* sometimes occurs as a *conj.*, as IV.

74. [149], i. e. *لَمَنْ وَاللَّهِ لَيَبْطُلَنَّ*; and IKh allows the admirative to occur as a *conj.* without subaudition of *saying*, as *جَاؤَنِي النَّبِيُّ مَا أَحْسَنَهُ*, while IBdh and the rest of the moderns disallow it, which is the right view, because it is originative (R). The *prop.* that *ns.* are conjoined with needs a *cop.*, which is (1) mostly a *pron.*, (a) mentioned, as *الَّذِينَ يُؤْمِنُونَ* II. 2. *Who believe*, XXXVI 35. [63], XLIII. 71. [498], [where Nāfi', Ibn

‘Āmir and Ḥafs read تَشْتَهِي (B, DM) according to the o. f. (B), and the rest of the Seven تَشْتَهِي (DM),] and  
 يَأْكُلُ مِمَّا تَأْكُلُونَ مِنْهُ XXIII. 34. 35. *He eateth of what ye eat of*; (b) supplied, as XIX. 70. [184], وَمَا عَمِلَتْ  
 أَيُّهُمْ XXXVI. 35. [in the reading of the KK (K, B) except Ḥafs (B)], XLIII. 71., and XXIII. 35. [507], suppression from the *conj.* being of stronger authority than from the *ep.*, and from the *ep.* than from the *enunc.* [63, 138]: (2) sometimes an explicit *n.*, as

فَيَا رَبَّ لَيْلَى أَنْتَ فِي كُلِّ مَوْطِنٍ  
 وَأَنْتَ الَّذِي فِي رَحْمَةِ اللَّهِ أَطْمَعُ

[by the Majnūn of Lailā al‘Āmiriyya, *Then, O Lord of Lailā, Thou art in every place; and Thou art He Whose mercy I long for* (Jsh)], which is rare, constructively, say they, فِي رَحْمَتِهِ, though they might construe it to be فِي رَحْمَتِكَ, like

وَأَنْتَ الَّذِي أَخْلَفْتَنِي مَا وَعَدْتَنِي

[*And thou art he that disappointed me of what thou promisedst me* (Jsh)]; and, according to this, the saying of Z that in VI. 1. [540] the coupling by ثُمَّ may be to the verbal *prop.* [خُلِقَ السَّمَوَاتِ (K)] is weak, because it involves the text's being an instance of this rare [con-



struction]. the *o. f.* being &، since the coupled to the *conj.*, being a *conj.*, must have a *cop.* (ML). When the conjunct or its qualified is an *enunc.* to a 1st *pers.*, the *rel.* may be of the 3rd *pers.*, which is more frequent, because explicit *ns.* are all of the 3rd *pers.*, as اَنَا الَّذِي because explicit *ns.* are all of the 3rd *pers.*, as اَنَا الَّذِي قَالَ كَذَا; or of the 1st *pers.* by syllepsis, as says 'Alī

أَنَا الَّذِي سَمِعْتُ أُمِّي حَيْدَرَةً \* ضَرْغَامَ أَجَامٍ وَلَيْثَ قَسُورَةٍ

[*I am he that my mother named Haidar (with the & of silence for pause), a lion of thickets, and a mighty lion! (Jsh))*]: and similarly when the conjunct or its qualified is an *enunc.* to a 2nd *pers.*, as أَنْتَ الرَّجُلُ الَّذِي أَنْتَ الرَّجُلُ الَّذِي قَالَ كَذَا, which is more frequent, or قُلْتَ كَذَا by syllepsis.

All of this is when it does not denote *comparison*, with which only the 3rd *pers.* is allowable, as اَنَا حَاتِمُ الَّذِي وَهَبَ الْمِئْيَةَ *I am (like) Hātim, who gave hundreds, i. o.*

مِثْلُ حَاتِمٍ : and, if there be two *prons.*, you may, except in *comparison*, make one of them accord with the letter, and the other with the sense, as اَنَا الَّذِي قُلْتُ كَذَا وَضَرَبْتُ and the other with the sense, as اَنَا الَّذِي قُلْتُ كَذَا وَضَرَبْتُ (R). The *conj.* of اَلْ is an *act. or pass. part.* (IH). The *act. part.* in الضَّارِبُ is in the sense of the *v.*; and, with the [*pron.* (IY)] governed in the *nom.* by it, is [*constructively* (IY)]

a *prop.* occurring as *conj.* to the *ل* ; while the mention [27] relates from it to the *ل* , as it relates to النَّبِيُّ (M).

The *o. f.* of الضَّارِبُ and المَضْرُوبُ [176] is الضَّرْبُ and الضَّرْبُ ; but, disliking that the *n. ل* , which resembles

the *p. ل* in letter, as is obvious, and in sense, as becoming with what it is prefixed to *det.*, like the *p.* with what it is prefixed to, should be prefixed to the semblance of the *v* , they transform the *v.* into the semblance of the *n.*, the *act. v.* into the semblance of the *act. part.*, and the *pass. v.* into the semblance of the *pass. part.*, because the two meanings are approximate, since the meaning of

زَيْدٌ ضَارِبٌ is زَيْدٌ ضَرَبَ or يَضْرِبُ , and that of زَيْدٌ مَضْرُوبٌ is زَيْدٌ ضَرِبَ or يَضْرِبُ : and it is because this *conj.* is a

*v.* in the semblance of a *n.* that it governs when in the sense of the past [345] ; whereas, if it were really an *act.* or *pass. part.*, it would not govern when in the sense of the past, like the synarthrous. The inflection ought to be upon the conjunct [176] ; but, since the *n. ل* is in the semblance of the *p. ل* , its inflection is transferred to its *conj.*, as in the case of *أَلَا* when it becomes *ي. ق. غَيْرُ*

[90], as جَاءَنِي الضَّارِبُ , رَأَيْتُ الضَّارِبَ , and مَرَرْتُ بِالضَّارِبِ

(R). *أَل* is sometimes [anomalously (IA)] conjoined [in poetry (R)] with (1) the nominal *prop.* (R, IA, ML), as

مِنْ الْقَوْمِ الرُّسُولُ اللَّهُ مِنْهُمْ \* لَهُمْ دَانَتْ رِقَابُ بَنِي مَعَدٍ

[I am of the people that the Apostle of God is of, that the necks of the children of Ma'add have submitted themselves to! (J)]: (2) the *adv.*, [i. e., says Shim, the *att. adv.*, in which the meaning of its *op.* resides, so that it becomes in the predicament of the *prop.* (DM),] as

مَنْ لَا يَزَالُ شَاكِرًا عَلَى الْمَعَّةِ \* فَهُوَ حُرٌّ بِعَيْشَةٍ ذَاتِ سَعَةٍ

(IA, ML) *Whoso ceases not to be thankful to God for what is with him is worthy of a life endowed with plenty* (J): (3) the [verbal *prop.* whose *v.* is an (ML)] *aor.* (R, IA, ML), as

يَقُولُ الْخَنَىٰ وَابْغَضَ الْعَجَمَ نَاصِقًا

إِلَىٰ رَبِّنَا صَوْتِ الْحِمَارِ الِیَجْدَعِ

(R, ML), by Dhu -lKhirak atTuhawī (FA, Jsh), *He speaks foul language, when the most hateful of the voices of the dumb brutes, when emitting sound, unto our Lord is the voice of the ass that is tied up* (DM, Jsh), whence

مَا أَنتَ بِالْحَكَمِ التَّرَضَىٰ حُكُومَتَهُ

وَلَا الْأَعْيِلُ وَلَا ذِي الرَّأْيِ وَالْجَدَلِ

[(2), by AlFarazdak, *Thou art not the judge whose judgment is approved, nor the man of pure lineage, nor the possessor of intelligence and power of controversy, where the ج of the conjunct اَلْ may be incorporated into the ت or not, contrary to the ج of the p. اَلْ (749) (J)];*

and this, according to the majority of the BB, is peculiar to poetry, while IM elsewhere asserts that it is allowable in a case of choice (IA). That [prefixion (DM)] is a proof that <sup>أ</sup>ل is not a *p.* of determination, [because the determinative is prefixed only to single terms (DM)]; but the whole is peculiar to poetry, contrary to the opinion of Akh and IM on the last (ML). And the KK hold that the *prim.* substantive made *det.* by the <sup>ل</sup> may be a conjunct; and say on <sup>أ</sup>لَئِنْ <sup>أ</sup>لْبَيْتِ <sup>أ</sup>أَنْ <sup>أ</sup>أَعْمُرِي [below] that it is constructively <sup>أ</sup>لَئِنْ <sup>أ</sup>أَعْمُرِي <sup>أ</sup>أَكْرَمُ <sup>أ</sup>أَنْ <sup>أ</sup>أَعْمُرِي *assuredly thou art the House that I honor etc*, but that it is not vague like the rest of the conjunct *ns.* [176]. The conjunct and *conj.* are like two parts of one *n.*; and, priority being due to the conjunct, because the *conj.* is explanatory of it, posteriority is necessary for the *conj.*: so that neither the *conj.* nor any part of it precedes the conjunct; nor does the *conj.* or what depends upon it govern what precedes the conjunct, because that *reg.* would then be part of the *conj.*; nor does the *conj.* depend upon what precedes the conjunct, through being headed by <sup>لَئِنْ</sup>, <sup>بَلْ</sup>, the sign of the *correl.* of the oath [600], or anything else that would have any dependence upon what precedes the conjunct, because the *conj.* is part of the conjunct, but not of anything else; nor is the conjunct separated from the *conj.*, nor part of the *conj.* from part, by an *appos.* of the conjunct, like the *corrob., ep.* [147], *subst., synd.*

*expl.*, and coupled, or by an *enunc.* of, or *exc.* from, the conjunct, since these things come only after the completion of the word. But in poetry a conjunct occurs coupled to another before the *conj.*; while what follows them is a *conj.* either to both of them together or to the last, the *conj.* of the first being in the latter case suppressed, indicated by the one expressed, as will be shown below in the suppressibility of the *conj.* upon the existence of indication: and sometimes the conjunct is separated from the *conj.* by the *reg.* of the *conj.*, as <sup>الَّذِي</sup> <sup>إِيَّاهُ</sup> <sup>ضَرَبْتُ</sup>, because the separation is not by an [expression] extraneous to both of them; whereas such [a separation] is not allowable when the conjunct is a *p.* [75], so that <sup>أَعْجَبْنِي</sup> <sup>أَيُّ</sup> <sup>زَيْدًا</sup> <sup>ضَرَبْتُ</sup> is not said, because the conjunct *ps.* [497], being infinitival *ps.* [571], which with the *prop.* after them are renderable by the *inf. n.*, require to be near the implier of the *inf. n.*; and similarly in the case of the conjunct <sup>أَلْ</sup>, since it is prefixed only to a *v.* in the semblance of an *act.* or *pass.* participial *n.*, so that it and what it is prefixed to are like the *p.* <sup>أَلْ</sup> and what it is prefixed to, which are not separated: and part of the *conj.* may be separated from part by something coupled to the *prop.* that is a *conj.*, as you say in the *cat.* of contest [22], when making the 1st govern, <sup>الَّذِي</sup> <sup>ضَرَبْتُ</sup> <sup>وَضَرَبُونِي</sup> <sup>غُلَامَانَهُ</sup> <sup>زَيْدٌ</sup> *He whose menservants I beat (and they beat me) was Zaid*, since the separation is not

by an [expression] extraneous to the *conj.*; and part of the *conj.* precedes part, as جَاؤَنِي الَّذِي مُنْطَلِقُ أَبُوهُ , [where the *enunc.* precedes the *inch.*], and جَاؤَنِي الَّذِي , [where the *obj.* precedes the *ag.*], since there is nothing to prevent it (R). Suppression of the conjunct *n.* [other than اَلْ (R)] is allowed by the KK (R, ML) and Akh (ML), contrary to the opinion of the BB: the former say that XXXVII. 164. [149] means سَلِّمِ الْآمِنُ لَهُ الْخَ save (him) that hath etc; and like it is the saying of AlMutanabbi

بَدَسَ اللَّيَالِي سَهْرَتٍ مِنْ طَرِبِي  
شَوْقًا إِلَى مَنْ يَبِيتُ يَرْقُدهَا

[Most evil are the nights that I have been sleepless in from my passion because of my longing for her that passes the nights sleeping through them (W), i. e. اللَّيَالِي سَهْرَتٍ (MAR)]; and the saying [of Abū Dhu'aib (Mb)]

لَعَمْرِي لَأَنْتَ الْبَيْتُ أَكْرَمُ أَهْلِهِ \* وَأَعَدُّ فِي أَفْيَائِهِ بِالْأَصَائِلِ  
[above] By my life, assuredly thou art the House that I honor the people of, and that I sit in the shades of in the evenings may be an instance of this (R): and IM follows them, but stipulates that it should be coupled to another conjunct; and among their proofs are أَمَّا بِالَّذِي

XXIX. 45. *We believe in that which hath been revealed to us and (that) which hath been revealed to you,*

أَمِنْ يَهْجُو رَسُولَ اللَّهِ مِنْكُمْ \* وَيُعَدِّدُ وَيُذْهِبُ سَوَاءً

by Ḥassān [Ibn Thābit alAnsārī, *Are he of you that satirizes the Apostle of God and (he) that praises him and helps him equal? (Jsh)*], and

مَا الَّذِي دَابَّةَ احْتِيَاظٍ وَحَزْمٍ \* وَهَوَاةٍ اَطَاعَ يَسْتَوِيَانِ

[*He whose habit is precaution and discretion and (he) that obeys his passion are not equal (Jsh)*], i. e. وَالَّذِي (ML): nor is there any reason, as respects analogy, for the disallowance of that by the BB, since some of the letters of the word are sometimes suppressed, even a ف or ع, as شَيْءٌ [699] and سَتَةٌ [orig. سَتَةٌ (MAR)], and the conjunct is not more adhesive than they (R). Suppression of the conj. [of the conjunct n. other than اَل (R), while the conjunct remains (DM)], is allowable, though rare (R, ML), when the conj. is known (R) through the indication of another conj., as

وَعِنْدَ الَّذِي وَاللَّاتِ عِدْنُكَ اَحْنَةُ  
عَلَيْكَ فَلَا يَخْزُرُكَ كَيْدُ الْعَوَائِدِ

[And in him (that visited thee when sick) and those women that visited thee when sick there is rancour against thee: then let not the cunning of the female visitors of the sick dupe thee (Jsh)], i. e. <sup>النَّيْ عَادَكَ</sup> ; or of something else, [like the context (DM),] as

<sup>نَحْنُ</sup> <sup>الْأُولَى</sup> <sup>فَاجْمَعِ</sup> <sup>جُومَ</sup> \* <sup>عَكَ</sup> <sup>ثُمَّ</sup> <sup>وَجْهَهُم</sup> <sup>الْبَيْنَا</sup>

[by 'Abīd Ibn alAbrās, *We are they (that have been renowned for valor): then muster thou thy hosts, and afterwards direct them towards us* (Jsh)], i. e. <sup>الْأُولَى</sup> <sup>عَرَفُوا</sup> <sup>الَّتِي</sup> (ML): and is invariably practised with <sup>الَّتِي</sup> [293] followed by <sup>الَّتِي</sup> coupled to it, when *calamities* are intended by them, in order that its suppression may import that the two *calamities*, the *little* and *great*, have arrived at such an inexplicable extreme of magnitude that they are left in their vagueness without any explanatory *conj.* (R): the poet says

<sup>بَعْدَ</sup> <sup>الَّتِي</sup> <sup>وَالَّتِي</sup> \* <sup>إِذَا</sup> <sup>عَلَّتْهَا</sup> <sup>أَنْفُسُ</sup> <sup>تَرَدَّتْ</sup>

where with each <sup>الَّتِي</sup>, as some say, the counterpart of the *cond. prop.* mentioned, but, as others say, <sup>دُقَّتْ</sup>, because the *dim.* necessarily involves that, or, as others say, <sup>عَظُمَتْ</sup>, because the *dim.* is one of magnification, as in <sup>دَوْبَهَيْةٌ</sup> <sup>أَخْ</sup> [117], is to be supplied, *After that calamity (which, when souls overcome it, is overthrown,*



or which has become little or great, and that calamity (which, when souls overcome it, is overthrown, or which has become little or great), and that calamity, which, when souls overcome it, is overthrown (ML). The *rel.* of **أَل** may not be suppressed, even if it be an *obj.*, because of the obscurity of **أَل** 's conjunctness, the *pron.* being one of the indications of its conjunctness; nor may one of two *rels.* when combined in the *conj.*, as **أَلِ الَّذِي ضَرْبَتُهُ فِي دَارِهِ زَيْدٌ**, since the remaining one would enable that suppressed one to be dispensed with, so that no indication of it would exist (R). The *pron.* [relating to the conjunct (IA)] may be suppressed, (1) if it be a *nom.*, only when it is an *inch.* and its *enunc.* is [a single term (IA),] not a *prop.* or [*att.* (IA)] *adv.* or *prep.* and *gen.*; because, if the *enunc.* were one of them, the fact that some thing had been suppressed would not be known, [since the *prop.* and *adv.* with the *rel.* in them are suitable for being a *conj.* (R)]: the [prescribed (R)] *inch.* may be suppressed, (a) [as the BB say (R),] in the *conj.* of (a) **أَيُّ**, [without any other condition, as XIX. 70. and **فَسَلِمَ النَّاسُ** (184), because lengthiness is realized in the conjunct itself by means of the prefixion (R),] even if the *conj.* be not long; (b) something else, only when the *conj.* is long, [as **وَهُوَ الَّذِي فِي السَّمَاءِ إِلَهٌ وَفِي الْأَرْضِ إِلَهٌ** XLIII. 84. And He is the One (that) is God in heaven and God in earth (498), the *conj.* being long

through the coupling to it (R)]: (b) as the KK allow, regularly, [in the *conj.* of <sup>أَيَّ</sup> *أَيَّ* or anything else, with or (R)] without length [of the *conj.* (IA)], as in the [anomalous (R)] reading [of Yahyà Ibn Ya'mar (K)] <sup>أَحْسَنُ</sup> *أَحْسَنُ* <sup>أَحْسَنُ</sup> *أَحْسَنُ* VI. 155. *To complete that (which)* was a most goodly religion, [i. e. <sup>أَحْسَنُ</sup> *أَحْسَنُ* : but it is allowed that <sup>أَحْسَنُ</sup> *أَحْسَنُ* in <sup>أَحْسَنُ</sup> *أَحْسَنُ* is conjunct (89), and <sup>أَحْسَنُ</sup> *أَحْسَنُ* the *enunc.* of a suppressed *inch.*, i. e. <sup>أَحْسَنُ</sup> *أَحْسَنُ* , <sup>أَحْسَنُ</sup> *أَحْسَنُ* , the *rel.*, vid. the *inch.* <sup>أَحْسَنُ</sup> *أَحْسَنُ* , being necessarily suppressed; so that this is a place where the head of the *conj.* is necessarily suppressed with something else than <sup>أَيَّ</sup> *أَيَّ* , when the *conj.* is not long; and it is regular, not anomalous (IA)]: (2) if it be an *acc.*, provided that it be not detached [after <sup>أَيَّ</sup> *أَيَّ* , as <sup>أَيَّ</sup> *أَيَّ* <sup>أَيَّ</sup> *أَيَّ* <sup>أَيَّ</sup> *أَيَّ* ], while in other cases there is no disallowance, as <sup>أَيَّ</sup> *أَيَّ* <sup>أَيَّ</sup> *أَيَّ* <sup>أَيَّ</sup> *أَيَّ* , i. e. <sup>أَيَّ</sup> *أَيَّ* <sup>أَيَّ</sup> *أَيَّ* , and <sup>أَيَّ</sup> *أَيَّ* <sup>أَيَّ</sup> *أَيَّ* (below), i. e. <sup>أَيَّ</sup> *أَيَّ* (R)], and that it be governed by the [*att.* (IA)] *v.* [or *qual.* (IA)], because the *pron.* is then a complement (R), as <sup>أَيَّ</sup> *أَيَّ* <sup>أَيَّ</sup> *أَيَّ* <sup>أَيَّ</sup> *أَيَّ* LXXIV. 11. *Leave thou Me and him (that) I have created alone* and XXV. 43. (63), i. e. <sup>أَيَّ</sup> *أَيَّ* <sup>أَيَّ</sup> *أَيَّ* <sup>أَيَّ</sup> *أَيَّ* , and similarly

مَا اللَّهُ مُوَلِّيكَ فَضْلٍ فَاحْمَدُهُ دَهْ  
فَمَا لَدَى غَيْرِهِ نَفْعٌ وَلَا ضَرَرٌ

{by Abu-lFath, *What God is vouchsafing thee is bounty: then do thou praise Him for it; for profit is not with any other than Him, nor injury* (J)}, i. e. *مُولِّيكَ*; and its suppression from the *v.* above mentioned is frequent, but from the *qual.* is rare (IA)]: (3) if it be a *gen.*, provided that it be governed by (a) prefixion [of an *ep.* constructively governing it in the *acc.* (R), (e. g.) of an *act. part.* in the sense of the present or future (IA), as *الَّذِي أَنَا ضَارِبٌ زَيْدٌ* (above), i. e. *ضَارِبُهُ* (R), whence XX. 75. *Then decree thou that (which) thou art about to decree*, i. e. *قَاضِيَهُ* (IA)]: (b) a [specified (R)] *p.*, [because the *prep.*, being unavoidably suppressed after suppression of the *gen.*, since a *prep.* does not remain without a *gen.*, ought to be specified, to the end that it may not be confounded after the suppression with any other, as *أَنَسْجِدُ لِمَا تَأْمُرُنَا* XXV. 61. *What! shall we bow down to that (which) thou commandest us (to honor)*, i. e. *تَأْمُرُنَا بِهِ*, i. e. *بِأَكْرَامِهِ*, and *فَاصْدَعْ بِمَا تُؤْمَرُ* XV. 94. *Then preach thou openly that (which) thou art commanded (to make manifest)*, i. e. *تُؤْمَرُ بِهِ*, i. e. *بِإِظْهَارِهِ*, and

فَقُلْتُ لَهَا لَا وَالَّذِي حَجَّ حَاتِمٌ \* أَخُونُكَ عَهْدًا أَنَّنِي غَيْرُ خَوَانٍ

*Then said I to her, I will not, by that (which) Hātim has performed the pilgrimage (to), be unfaithful to thee in a covenant: verily I am not faithless, i. e.*

حَجَّ حَاتِمٌ إِلَيْكَ, the *prep.* being regularly specified (R)] when the conjunct [or its qualified (R, FA)] is governed in the *gen.* by a *p.* like it in [letter and (IA)] sense, and the two *ops.* [498] are alike [in crude-form (IA)], as مَرَرْتُ بِالنَّيِّ [or انت مار (IA)], i. e. بِ (R, IA), whence XXIII. 35. [507], i. e. مِنْهُ, and

وَقَدْ كَذَبْتَ تَخْفَى حُبَّ سَمْرَاءَ حَقْبَةً

فَبَيَّحْ لَأَنَّ مِنْهَا بِالَّذِي أَنْتَ بَائِضٌ

[by 'Antara, *And*, by God, thou hast been hiding the love of Samrā a long time: then divulge thou now (orig.

الآن) of the love of her that (which) thou art about to divulge (J)], i. e. بِ (IA), and as مَرَرْتُ بِزَيْدٍ الَّذِي مَرَرْتُ (R), whence

لَا تَرْكَنْ إِلَى الْأَمْرِ الَّذِي رَكَنْتَ

إِبْنَاءُ يَعْصُرُ حِينَ اضْطَرَّهَا الْقَدَرُ

by Ka'b Ibn Zuhair, *Do not thou incline to the matter (that) the sons of Ya'ṣur inclined (to) when destiny con-*

*strained them*, i. e. رَكَنْتُ إِلَيْهِ (FA); but sometimes the *gen.* governed by a *p.* is suppressed, though the *p.* is not specified, as الَّذِي مَرَرْتُ بِهِ, i. e. مَرَرْتُ بِهِ, which might be مَرَرْتُ مَعَهُ or لَمْ or the like: and in case (3, b) Ks holds the suppression of the *prep.* and *gen.* to be gradual, while S and Akh hold it to be simultaneous [1, 144] (R).

§ 178. الَّذِي is constituted a connective to the qualification of *dets.* by *props.* [176]: but [the fact announced by] the *prop.* that it is conjoined with ought to be known to the person addressed [177], as in your saying هَذَا الَّذِي قَدِمَ مِنَ الْخَضِرَةِ This man, *who has arrived from town* to him whom that [fact] has reached, [because the object of the *conj. prop.* is to determine the mentioned by means of that state of it which is known by the person addressed, in order that it may afterwards be predicable of, the *conj.* being the contrary of the attribute, which ought to be unknown to the person addressed, because the object of the attribute is to communicate to the person addressed some state of him that he knows; and therefore you do not say جَاءَ الَّذِي قَامَ He that stood came except to him that knows his standing, but is ignorant of his coming, because جَاءَ is an attribute and قَامَ a *conj.*; nor أَقْبَلَ الَّذِي أَبَوْهُ مَنْطَلِقَ He whose father was departing approached except to

him that knows his father's *departure*, but is ignorant of his *approach* (IY)]. And, because of their deeming it too long by reason of its *conj.*, together with frequency of usage, they lighten it without any [other (AAz)] reason, saying <sup>لَـ</sup>اللَّز by elision of the <sup>ي</sup> [176], and then <sup>لَـ</sup>اللَّز by elision of the vowel; and even suppress it altogether, contenting themselves with the [ <sup>ل</sup> and (IY)] <sup>ل</sup> [176] in its stead: and do the like with its *fem.*, saying <sup>لَـ</sup>الَّت [176], <sup>لَـ</sup>الَّت, and <sup>لَـ</sup>الضَّارِبَةُ هُنْدُ i. q. <sup>لَـ</sup>الَّتِي : and elide the <sup>ن</sup> from its *du.* and *pl.* [176], as in the saying of [AlAkhtal (ID, Jsh), or, as is said (Jsh),] AlFarazdaq

أَبْنِي كُلَيْبٍ إِنَّ عَمَى اللَّذَا \* قَدَلَا الْعُلُوكَ وَفَكَكَا الْأَغْلَالَا

[O Banu Kulaib, verily my two paternal uncles were the two that slew the kings and loosed the yokes (Jsh)], <sup>لَـ</sup>وَالَّذِي حَانَتْ أَلْمَحْ [117], and IX. 70. [571] like them that have plunged; [though <sup>لَـ</sup>الَّذِي may be *sing.*, but indicate the *pl.*, in which case the *rel. pron.*, if *sing.*, is so from regard to the letter, and, if *pl.*, is so by syllepsis, as in the case of <sup>لَـ</sup>مَنْ (182); and similar is <sup>لَـ</sup>وَالَّذِي جَاءَ XXXIX. 34. And he that hath spoken the truth and believed it, those are the pious, while in <sup>لَـ</sup>الَّذِي اسْتَوْقَدَ نَارًا فَلَمَّا

أَضَاعَتْ مَا حَوْلَهُ نَهَبَ اللَّهُ بِنُورِهِمْ وَتَرَكَّهُمْ فِي ظُلُمَاتٍ لَا يُبْصِرُونَ II. 16. *Their similitude is like the similitude of*

*him that hath kindled a fire, and that, when it hath brightened what is round him, God taketh away (503) the light of, and that He leaveth in darkness, seeing not the rel. pron. is now sing. and now pl. (IY)].*

§ 179. The range of **الَّذِي** in the process of enunciation is wider than that of the **ل** *syn.* with it, since **الَّذِي** is prefixed in the case of the nominal and verbal *props.*, but the **ل** only in the case of the verbal: thus, when you make an *enunc.* from **زَيْدٌ** in **قَامَ زَيْدٌ** and **زَيْدٌ** **الَّذِي** **هُوَ** **مَنْطَلِقٌ زَيْدٌ** and **الَّذِي** **قَامَ زَيْدٌ** **مَنْطَلِقٌ**, you say **الَّذِي** **قَامَ زَيْدٌ** and **الَّذِي** **مَنْطَلِقٌ زَيْدٌ**, but not **الَّذِي** **مَنْطَلِقٌ زَيْدٌ** (M), because **أَل** is not prefixed to the *inch.* and *enunc.* [177] (IY). An *enunc.* is not made to **أَل** except from a *n.* in the verbal *prop.* exclusively, because the *conj.* of **أَل** is an *act.* or *pass. part.* [177], which with its *nom.* can be moulded from the verbal *prop.*, when the *v.* is *act.* or *pass.* respectively, since the sense of the *act.* or *pass. part.* is akin to the sense of **فَعَلَ** and **يَفْعَلُ** or **فُعِلَ** and **يُفْعَلُ**, as **زَيْدٌ** **ضَرَبَ**, i. e. **ضَرَبَ** or **يَضْرِبُ**, and **زَيْدٌ** **مَضْرُوبٌ**, i. e. **ضَرِبَ** or **يُضْرَبُ**; whereas an *act.* or *pass. part.* with its *nom.* is

not in the sense of the nominal *prop.*, so that one of them with the *nom.* should be moulded from it. In such as <sup>أَصَارِبُ</sup> <sup>الزَّيْدَانِ</sup> and <sup>مَا</sup> <sup>مُضْرُوبُ</sup> <sup>الْبَكَرَانِ</sup> [24] indeed they with their *noms.* are nominal [*props.*]; but here they are preceded by two *ps.* that prevent their occurrence as *conj.*s, of the <sup>أَل</sup>, as will be shown immediately. The *v.* that the *conj.* of <sup>أَل</sup> is moulded from must be plastic, since the *act.* or *pass. part.* does not come from the aplastic, like <sup>لَيْسَ</sup>, <sup>عَسَى</sup>, <sup>حَبَّذَا</sup>, <sup>بِئْسَ</sup>, <sup>نَعِمَ</sup>; and must not be preceded by a *p.* whose meaning is not imported from the *act.* or *pass. part.*, like the <sup>سَيُ</sup>, <sup>سَرَفٌ</sup>, *neg. p.*, and *interrog. p.* (R). This process has been instituted by the GG for the [examination and (IA)] exercise of the student (R, IA) in the questions that he has learnt in some of the *cats.* of syntax (R). Enunciation from every *n.* in a [complete enunciatory (IY)] *prop.* is permissible, [because these *props.* occur as *conj.*s. (177) and *eps.* (144) (IY),] except when some preventive [mentioned below (IY)] prevents [it (IY)]. The method of enunciation is to put the conjunct [ <sup>الَّذِي</sup> or <sup>أَل</sup> (IY)] at the beginning of the *prop.* [in the position of an *inch.* (IY)], and relegate the *n.* [that you mean to make an *enunc.* from (IY)] to its end, [making it an *enunc.* to the conjunct, and (IY)] putting in its place a *pron.* relating to the conjunct; e. g., in making an *enunc.* (1) from <sup>زَيْدٌ</sup> and





<sup>ضربت</sup> coupled to it contains a mention relating to the conjunct, and completes the *conj.* (IY). The conjunct must agree in number and gender with the *n.* made an *enunc.* to it; so that, when told to make an *enunc.* from <sup>ضربت</sup>, <sup>ضربت</sup> <sup>الزيدين</sup>, and <sup>هندا</sup> in <sup>ضربت</sup> <sup>الزيدين</sup>, <sup>الزيدين</sup>, and <sup>هندا</sup>, you say <sup>الَّذَانِ ضَرَبْتَهُمَا</sup> <sup>ضربت</sup> <sup>هندا</sup>, and <sup>الَّذِي ضَرَبْتُهَا</sup> <sup>هندا</sup>, and <sup>الَّذِينَ ضَرَبْتَهُمُ</sup> <sup>الزيدون</sup>, <sup>الزيدان</sup>. If the *qual.* occurring as *conj.* of <sup>أل</sup> govern a *pron.* in the *nom.*, the *pron.*, if it relate to <sup>أل</sup>, is latent; but, if it relate to something else, is detached: so that, when you say <sup>بَلَّغْتَ مِنَ الزَّيْدَيْنِ إِلَى الْعَمْرَيْنِ رِسَالَةً</sup>, if you make an *enunc.* from the *t* in <sup>بَلَّغْتَ</sup>, you say <sup>الْمَبْلَغُ مِنَ الزَّيْدَيْنِ</sup> <sup>بَلَّغْتَ</sup>, you say <sup>الْمَبْلَغُ مِنَ الزَّيْدَيْنِ</sup> <sup>بَلَّغْتَ</sup> <sup>إِلَى الْعَمْرَيْنِ رِسَالَةً</sup> <sup>أَنَا</sup> *He that conveyed a message from the two Zaid's to the 'Amrs was I*, a *pron.* relating to <sup>أل</sup> being in <sup>الْمَبْلَغُ</sup>; but, if you make an *enunc.* from <sup>الزيدين</sup>, you say <sup>الْمَبْلَغُ أَنَا مِنْهُمَا إِلَى الْعَمْرَيْنِ رِسَالَةً</sup> <sup>الزيدان</sup> *The two that I conveyed a message from to the 'Amrs were the two 'Zaid's*, <sup>أَنَا</sup> being governed in the *nom.* by <sup>الْمَبْلَغُ</sup>, but not relating to <sup>أل</sup>, because what is meant by <sup>أل</sup> here is a *du.*, vid. the *n.* that the *enunc.* is made from; and, if you make an *enunc.* from <sup>الْعَمْرَيْنِ</sup>, you say <sup>أَنَا</sup> <sup>الْمَبْلَغُ</sup> <sup>إِلَى الْعَمْرَيْنِ رِسَالَةً</sup> <sup>الزيدان</sup>

They that I conveyed a message to from the two Zaid<sup>s</sup> were the ‘Amrs; and similarly when you make an enunc. from رِسَالَةٌ, because what is meant by آل here is the message, whereas what is meant by the pron. that the conj. governs in the nom. is the speaker, so that you say أَنَا مِنَ الزَّيْدَيْنِ الْمُبْلَغُهَا That which I conveyed from the two Zaid<sup>s</sup> to the ‘Amr was a message. The n. that an enunc. is made from must be (1) susceptible of (a) postponement, so that an enunc. is not made from what takes the head of the sentence, like the cond. and interrog. ns., as مَنْ and مَا; (b) determination, so that an enunc. is not made from the d. s. and sp.: (2) replaceable by (a) an extraneous [word], so that an enunc. is not made from the pronominal cop. of the prop. occurring as an enunc., like the ذ in زَيْدٌ صَرَبَتْكَ [below]: (b) a pron., so that an enunc. is not made from the qualified without its ep., nor from the pre. without the post., as from رَجُلًا alone in ضَرَبْتُ رَجُلًا ظَرْفًا, or غَلَامٌ alone in ضَرَبْتُ غَلَامٌ زَيْدٌ, because, if you did make an enunc. from it, you would put a pron. in its place, whereas the pron. is not qualified [147] nor pre. [112]; but you may make an enunc. from the qualified together with its ep., or from the pre. together with the post., because this objection does not

exist, as <sup>ضربتة رجل ظريف</sup> or <sup>غلام زيد</sup> (IA). Enunciation is disallowed in the case of (1) the *pron.* of the case [167], because it is entitled to the 1st place in the sentence, [does not relate to an explicit *n.*, and is expounded only by the *prop.* after it; whereas, if you made it an *enunc.*, it would become posterior, would relate to the conjunct before it, and would not be expounded by a *prop.* (IY)]: (2) the *pron.* in <sup>زيد منطلق</sup> in <sup>زيد منطلق</sup> [26], the *ض* in <sup>زيد ضربتة</sup> [27], or [the *ض* in (IY)] <sup>مدة</sup> in <sup>السمي منوان مئة بدرهم</sup> [25, 27], because, if it [were replaced by a *pron.* that (IY)] related to the conjunct, the *inch.* [ <sup>زيد</sup> or <sup>السمي</sup> (IY)] would remain without a *rel.*: (3) the *inf. n.* or *d. s.* in such as <sup>ضربى زيدا قائما</sup> [29], because, (a) if you said <sup>الذي هو زيدا قائما ضربى</sup>, you would make the *pron.* [ <sup>هو</sup> (IY)] govern [ <sup>زيدا قائما</sup> in the *acc.*, whereas the *inf. n.*, when expressed by a *pron.*, does not govern, so that <sup>مرورى بزید حسن وهو</sup> is not allowable, because the *inf. n.* governs only through the letters of the *v.* contained in it, and through its being renderable by <sup>أن</sup> and the *v.*, while after the metonymy the letters of the *v.* quit it, and it is not renderable by <sup>أن</sup> and the *v.* (IY)]; (b) if you said

الَّذِي ضَرَبَنِي زَيْدًا أَيَاةً قَائِمٌ, you would express the *d. s.* by a *pron.*, whereas only what may be made *det.* [78] may be expressed by a *pron.* [262] (M).

§ 180. مَا is (1) a *det.*, (a) incomplete [44], which is the conjunct, as XVI. 98. [2]: (b) complete [520], (a) general, i. e. renderable by الشَّيْءُ, which is the one that is not preceded by a *n.* whereof it and its *op.* are an *ep.* in sense, as II. 273. [419], i. e. فَنَعَمُ الشَّيْءُ هِيَ most excellent will be the thing, they!, [where هِيَ (DM),] orig. اِبْدَاؤُهَا the display of them!, because the discourse is about the *display*, not about the *alms*, [is particularized by praise (DM)]; (b) particular, which is the one that is preceded by that [*n.* whereof it and its *op.* are an *ep.* in sense, the restriction *in sense* being added because the *ep.* in grammar is a suppressed word governing the *prop.* of مَا (DM)], and that is rendered from the letter of that *n.*, as غَسَلْتُ غَسْلًا نَعْمًا I washed him with a washing, whereof it is said, Most excellent is the washing!, i. e. نَعَمُ الْغَسْلُ, [this غَسْلًا being the *n.*, and نَعَمُ and مَا an *ep.* of it in sense, orig. غَسْلًا مَقُولًا فَيَدُ نَعَمُ, because the originative *prop.* is not used as an *ep.*, as they say on جَاؤُوا بِمَنَاقِخٍ (144) (DM)]: most GG do not authorize the occurrence of مَا as a complete

*det.*; but some authorize it, among them IKh, who transmits it from S: (2) an *indet.*, (a) bare of the sense of the *p.*, (a) incomplete, which is the qualified, and is rendered by <sup>شئ</sup>شئ, as <sup>مررت بما معجب لك</sup>مررت بما معجب لك *I passed by a thing pleasing to thee* [147], i. e. <sup>بشيء معجب لك</sup>بشيء معجب لك,

<sup>لما نافع يسعى اللبيب فلا تكن</sup>لما نافع يسعى اللبيب فلا تكن \* <sup>لشيء بعيد نفعه الدهر ساعيا</sup>لشيء بعيد نفعه الدهر ساعيا  
[For a profitable thing strives the sagacious: then be not thou striving for a thing whose profit is for ever distant (Jsh)], and

<sup>ربما تكره النفوس من الامـر له</sup>ربما تكره النفوس من الامـر له <sup>فرجة كحل العقال</sup>فرجة كحل العقال

[by Umayya Ibn Abi -sSalt, *Many a thing (that) souls dislike of the matter has a relief like the unfastening of the rope that fastens together the foreshank and arms of the camel* (AAz)], i. e. <sup>دب شيء تكره النفوس</sup>دب شيء تكره النفوس, while

S says that <sup>هذا ما لدى عتيدي</sup>هذا ما لدى عتيدي L. 22. means *This [unbeliever (DM)] is a thing in my power, made ready (for*

*Hell by my misleading him)*: (b) complete, which occurs in three *cats.*, (α) wonder, as <sup>ما احسن زيدا</sup>ما احسن زيدا *How goodly is Zaid!* [25, 479], i. e.

<sup>شيء حسن زيدا</sup>شيء حسن زيدا *Something has made Zaid goodly!*, as all the BB decide, except Akh, who

allows it, and allows <sup>ما</sup>ما to be a conjunct *det.* or a qualified

*indet.*; (β) the *cat.* of <sup>نعم</sup>نعم and <sup>بشئ</sup>بشئ, as in <sup>غسلته النع</sup>غسلته النع

[above], i. e. <sup>نعم شيئا</sup>نعم شيئا *Most excellent is it as a thing,* <sup>ما</sup>ما

being governed in the *acc.* as a *sp.* [of the vague *pron.* (DM)], according to many of the moderns, among them Z [471]; ( $\gamma$ ) their saying, when they mean to exaggerate in predicating of any one the *frequent performance* of an act, like *writing*, <sup>اِنَّ زَيْدًا مِّمَّا اِنْ يَكْتُبُ</sup>, i. e. <sup>مِنْ</sup> <sup>اِنَّ</sup> <sup>مِمَّا</sup> <sup>اِنْ</sup> <sup>يَكْتُبُ</sup>, meaning *Verily Zaid is (created) of a matter, (namely) writing*, <sup>ما</sup> being i. q. <sup>شَيْءٍ</sup>, and <sup>اِنَّ</sup> and its *conj.* in the position of a *gen.* as a *subst.* for it, and the sense being the same as in <sup>خُلِقَ الْاِنْسَانُ مِنْ عَجَلٍ</sup> XXI. 38. *Man was created of hastiness*, where *man*, because of the *frequency* of his *hastiness*, is declared to have been as it were *created* of it: (b) made to imply the sense of the *p.*, being (a) *interrog.*, the meaning of which is <sup>اَي شَيْءٍ</sup> <sup>يُبَيِّنُ لَنَا مَا هِيَ</sup> II. 63. *He will explain to us what she is*, <sup>اَي شَيْءٍ</sup> <sup>يُبَيِّنُ لَنَا مَا لَوْنُهَا</sup> II. 64. *He will explain to us what her color is*, and <sup>وَمَا تَلَكَ بِيَمِينِكَ</sup> XX. 18. *And what is that [186] in thy right hand?* (ML): the *interrog.* <sup>ما</sup> sometimes implies the meaning of ( $\alpha$ ) *contempt*, as <sup>يَا زَبْرِكَانُ اَخَا بَنِي خَلَفٍ \* مَا اَنْتَ وَبِ اَيْيِكَ وَالْفَخْرُ</sup> [by AlMukhabbal asSa'di, *O Zibrikan, brother of the Banu Khalaf, what thing art thou (woe to thy father!) and glory?* (AAz)]; ( $\beta$ ) *magnification*, as <sup>يَا سَيِّدَا النَّهْجِ</sup> [85] and LXIX. 1. 2. [27]; ( $\gamma$ ) *disapproval*, as <sup>فَيْمَ اَنْتَ</sup>

LXXIX. 43. *What [181] hast thou to do with the mention of the time of it?, i. e. Do not thou mention it according to one of the interpretations (R): (b) cond., (α) not temporal, as II. 193. [419], II. 100. [499], and, as allowed by some, XVI. 55. And whatever prosperity (is) with you etc. [32], orig. مَا يَكُنْ بِكُمْ , the v. of the condition being afterwards suppressed, as in*

إِنَّ الْعَقْلَ فِي أَمْرِنَا لَا نَضِقُ بِهِا  
ذُرَاعًا وَإِنْ صَبِرًا فَنَصِيرٌ لِلصَّبْرِ

[by Hudba Ibn AlKhashram al'Udhri, *If the price of blood (be) among our goods, we shall not be too straitened to pay it (the دِيَّةُ), and, if (we be confined) with confinement, we shall be patient of the confinement (Jsh), i. e. أَنْ يَكُنِ الْعَقْلُ , like V. 96. (419) (DM), i. e. أَنْ يَكُنِ الْعَقْلُ and وَإِنْ صَبِرًا , [an exposition of وَإِنْ صَبِرًا , because الصَّبْرُ means الصَّبْرُ (DM)]; (β) temporal, which is authorized by F, AB, ASH, IBr, and IM, and is obvious in IX. 7. Then, whenever they are upright towards you as touching the covenant, be ye upright towards them as touching the fulfilment, i. e. Be ye upright towards them during the period of their uprightness towards you, and is admissible in IV. 28. [Then*



whatever time ye enjoy them in, give ye them their dowries, بَ being i. q. فَيَ , and the مَن in مَنَّهُنَّ i. q. the ب (DM)], except that this مَ is an *inch.*, not adverbial, [contrary to the one preceding (DM),] and in وَمَا تَكُ يَا ابْنُ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ فِينَا \* فَلَا ظُلْمًا نَخَافُ وَلَا أَفْتَقَارًا (ML), by AlFarazdaq, *And, whenever thou art, O son of 'Abd Allāh, among us, neither wrong shall we fear, nor want* (Dw). The مَ that follows the *indet.* to import *vagueness* and *corroboration of indeterminateness* is said by some to be a *n.*; so that II. 24. [565] means مَثَلًا أَيْ مِثْلُ *A parable, what a parable!*: and the import of this مَ is (1) *contempt*, as هَلْ أُعْطِيتَ إِلَّا عَطِيَّةً مَّا *Hast thou given aught save some paltry gift?*; (b) *magnification*, as لَأَمْرٌ مَّا جَدَعُ قَصِيرٌ أَنْفَهُ *To some purpose did Kaṣīr cut off his nose* and لَأَمْرٌ مَّا يَسُودُ الْخ [122]; (c) *modification*, as اِضْرِبْهُ ضَرْبًا مَّا *Beat thou him with some beating*, i. e. *with one of its modes, whichever of them it be*: and these meanings are all combined in *vagueness* and *corroboration of indeterminateness*, i. e. *a gift that is not known from its paltriness and a purpose that is not known from its greatness and an unknown, unspecified beating* (R). مَ denotes (1) [mostly (R, IA)] the *irrational* (R, IA, Sh), as XVI. 98. [2] (Sh); (2) sometimes the *rational*, as لَنَا سُبْحَانُ مَا سَخَّرَكُنْ لَنَا *Extolled be the perfection of Him*

Who hath subjected you unto us! and سَبَّحَانَ مَا سَبَّحَ Extolled be the perfection of Him in praise of Whom [the hearer of (K on XIII. 14.)] the thunder exclaims "Extolled be God's perfection"! (R, IA), both transmitted by AZ (R), and فَانْكُحُوا مَا طَابَ لَكُمْ مِنْهُنَّ IV. 3. Marry ye what women please you, two each, and three each, and four each (IA); (3) often also the *qualities of the rational*, as زَيْدٌ مَا هُوَ Zaid, what is he?, which is a question as to his *quality*, the reply being عَالِمٌ Learned or something else [556]; (4) sometimes the *unknown in quiddity and essence*, as مَا هَذَا أَفَرَسٌ أَمْ بَقْرٌ أَمْ إِنْسَانٌ What is this, a horse, or an ox, or a man?: and the saying of Pharoah وَمَا رَبُّ الْعَالَمِينَ XXVI. 22. And what is the Lord of the worlds? may be a question as to the *quality*, for which reason Moses says رَبُّ السَّمَوَاتِ XXVI. 23. The Lord of the heavens; or as to the *quiddity*, but Moses answers by explaining the *qualities*, not the *quiddity*, as a warning to Pharoah that He is not known save by His *qualities*, His *quiddity* being unknown to man: and their sayings سَبَّحَانَ الْآلِ and سُبُّحَانَ الْآلِ [above] may be because God is unknown in *quiddity* (R).

§ 181. Its *l* is subject to conversion and elision. The conversion is in (1) the *interrog.*, as in the tradition

of Abū Dhū'aib " I arrived at AlMadīna, when its inhabitants were making an outcry through weeping, like the outcry of the pilgrims when they shout <sup>لَبَّيْكَ</sup> at entering the Sacred Territory : so I said <sup>مَا</sup> *What?*, [meaning <sup>مَا</sup> <sup>الْخَبْرُ</sup> or <sup>الْأَمْرُ</sup> *What (is the news or the matter)?* (IY)] ; and it was said, The Apostle of God has perished," [and in <sup>قَدْ وَرَدَتْ الْخَبْرُ</sup> (175, 690), i. e. <sup>فَمَا</sup> <sup>أَصْنَعُ</sup> or <sup>فَمَا</sup> <sup>قُدْرَتِي</sup> *What (is my power)?* (IY)] : (2) the *cond.*, when the *red.* <sup>مَا</sup> is affixed to it, [so that they say <sup>مَهْمَا</sup> (IY),] as VII. 129. [419] (M). <sup>مَهْمَا</sup> is a *n.*, because the *pron.* relates to it in VII. 129: but Suh asserts that it occurs as a *p.* on the evidence of <sup>وَمَهْمَا</sup> <sup>تَكُنْ</sup> <sup>الْخَبْرُ</sup> *And, if any disposition be in a man, though etc* [499], where, says he, it is a *p.* i. q. <sup>إِنْ</sup> *If*; and he is followed by IYn, who cites <sup>مَهْمَا</sup> <sup>تُصَبُّ</sup> <sup>الْخَبْرُ</sup> [22]. Some say that <sup>مَهْمَا</sup> is an *adv.* of time, [i. q. <sup>مَتِيْمَا</sup> *Whenever* (K on VII. 129.),] and that the sense is <sup>أَيَّ</sup> <sup>وَقْتٍ</sup> <sup>تُصَبُّ</sup> <sup>بَارِقًا</sup> *أي وقت تصب بارقًا* in whatever time they find a cloud charged with lightning from a border of the horizon, the sentence being transposed; or <sup>فِي</sup> <sup>أَفْقٍ</sup> <sup>بَارِقًا</sup> *في أفق بارقًا* in a border of the horizon a cloud etc, <sup>مِنْ</sup> being *red.* and <sup>أَفْقًا</sup> used as an *adv.*: but it will be shown that <sup>مَهْمَا</sup> is not used as an *adv.* (ML).

It is, (1) according to Khl, *orig.* [the *cond.*] مَا; while, [the *red.*] مَا being sometimes added to *cond.* words [565], as مَا مَتَى and مَا أَيْنَ, they add مَا to مَا, as they add مَا to مَتَى, so that it becomes مَا مَا; and then, deeming this expression inelegant because of the repetition of the 2 words, they substitute a ڤ for the 1st ٱ, saying مَهْمَا, since the ٱ and ڤ are from one outlet [732]: (2) as others say, compounded of مَ i. q. أَكْفَ [187] and the *cond.* مَا, the sense, according to them, being *Abstain thou (from everything): whatever (thou dost I will do)*: (3) as others say, a simple *n.*, whose meaning is *generality*, because, say they, the *o.f.* is absence of composition. The 1st saying is confirmed by the *pron.*'s relating to مَهْمَا, as it relates to مَا, as in VII. 129.; and the 2nd by the saying of the poet

أَمَاوِيَّ مَهْمَنْ يَسْتَمِعْ فِي صَدِيقَةٍ  
أَقَارِيلَ هَذَا النَّاسِ مَارِيَّ يَنْدِمُ

O Māwīya, whoso hearkens to the speeches of this people about his friend, Māwīya, will repent, since he compounds مَا with مَنْ, as you compound it with مَا (IY).

It is simple, not compounded of مَا and the *cond.* مَا, [as though مَا كَفَّ were said (K), though the sense of مَا would not necessarily remain, because another meaning

might be 'produced by the composition (DM)] ; nor of the *cond.* مَا and *red.* مَا , the 8 being afterwards substituted for the 1st 1 to avoid the repetition. And it has three meanings, (1) *what is irrational, other than time, together with* the implied sense of *condition*, whence the text [VII. 129. (DM)], for which reason it is expounded by <sup>مِنْ</sup> آيَةٍ [499]: here it is either an *inch.* or an *acc.* by <sup>دِ</sup> distraction ; and in the latter case a *trans.* *op.* is supplied for it, as in <sup>زَيْدًا</sup> مَرَّتْ بِهِ [62], posterior to it, because it takes the head [of the sentence], i. e. <sup>مَهْمَا</sup> تَحْضُرُنَا تَاتَا بِهِ *Whatsoever sign (thou present to us), thou bring it unto us:* (2) *time and condition*, in which case it is an *adv.* to the *v.* of the condition: this is mentioned by IM, who asserts that the GG neglect it, and cites

وَأَنْكَ مَهْمَا تَعْطِ بِطَنِكَ سَوْأَةً  
وَفَرَجَكَ نَالًا مِنْتَهَى الذَّمِّ أَجْمَعًا

by Hātim [atTā'i, *And verily, whenever thou givest thy belly its craving, and thy penis, they will get the extreme of blame, all of it* (DM)], and other verses ; but there is no evidence in that, because it may denote the *inf. n.*, [in which case it is of the 1st kind, because the *inf. n.* belongs to *what is irrational, other than time* (DM),] in the sense of [*however, i. e.*] *with whatever giving, much or little* : and in this saying [that مَهْمَا denotes

*time and condition* (DM)] IM has been anticipated by others; but Z [in the K on VII. 129.] severely reproaches those who say it, and it is impossible in the text, even if it were correctly affirmable elsewhere, because مَهْمَا is expounded by مِنْ آيَةٍ : (3) *interrogation*: this is mentioned by many, IM being among them, who cite مَهْمَا لِي اللَّيْلَةُ الْغَ [503]; but there is no evidence in the verse, because مَا may be a verbal *n. i. q.* أَكْفَ [in which case its conjunction in writing is for the sake of puzzling (DM),] and مَا alone an inceptive interrogation, *Hold! what etc?* (ML). The elision is in the *interrog.* when the *preps.* are prefixed to it (M). The *ʃ* of the *interrog.* مَا is [necessarily (ML)] elided when it is governed in the *gen.* (R, ML) by a *prep.* or *pre. n.* [615]; though sometimes the *ʃ* occurs expressed, as

عَلَى مَا قَامَ يَشْتُمُنِي لَتَيْمٌ \* كَخَنَزِيرٍ تَوَرَّغَ فِي دُمَائِ

[below] (R), by Ḥassān Ibn AlMundhir, *For what has a low fellow stood up reviling me, like a hog that has wallowed in ashes?* (Jsh): and the Fatha [is necessarily (DM)] retained as an indication of it, as

فَتَلَكُ وَلَاةُ السُّوءِ قَدْ طَالَ مَكْتَهُمْ  
فَصَحَّتْ حَتَامُ الْعَنَاءِ الْمَطُولِ

[by AlKumait Ibn Zaid alAsadī, *Then those are the rulers of evil. Their abiding (amongst us) has become long: then until what (time), until what (time) shall the*

*lengthened weariness (of them) be?* (Jsh)]; though sometimes the Fatha follows it in elision, which is peculiar to poetry, as

يَا أَبَا الْأَسْوَدِ لِمَ خَلَفْتَنِي \* لِإِهْمُومٍ طَارِقَاتٍ وَذِكْرِ

[*O Abu-l-Aswad, wherefore hast thou left me behind thee to nightly-haunting griefs and memories?* (Jsh)].

The *l*, being elided to distinguish between interrogation and enunciation, is elided in such as LXXIX. 43. [180],

فَنَظَرَةٌ بِمِ يَرْجِعُ الْمُرْسَلُونَ XXVII. 35. *And shall see with*

*what the messengers will return, and* لِمَ تَقُولُونَ مَا لَا تَفْعَلُونَ

LXI. 2. *Wherefore say ye what ye do not?*; but expressed

in لِمَسَّكُمْ فِيمَا أَفَضْتُمْ فِيهِ عَذَابٌ عَظِيمٌ XXIV. 14. *A great chastisement would have befallen you for that slander*

*which ye plunged into, مَا أَنْزَلَ إِلَيْكَ* II. 3.

[*Who*] *believe in what hath been revealed unto thee, and*

مَا مَنَعَكَ أَنْ تَسْجُدَ لِمَا خَلَقْتَ بِيَدَيَّ XXXVIII. 75.

*What hindered thee from doing obeisance unto what I created with My two hands?*: and, as the *l* is not elided

in enunciation, so is it not expressed in interrogation, the reading of [Abū 'Abd Allāh (Nw, IKhn, DM)] 'Ikrima

[Ibn 'Abd Allāh (IKhn) alHāshimī alMadanī (Nw), the freedman of {'Abd Allāh (IKhn)} Ibn 'Abbās (Nw,

IKhn, DM)] and 'Isā [Ibn 'Umar (K, DM) alAsadī, the

Kūfī Reader, known as AlHamdānī (DM),] عَمَّا يَتَسَاءَلُونَ

LXXVIII. 1. [below] being extraordinary, and the say-

ing of Ḥassān عَلَى مَا قَامَ الْخُ [above] being a poetic license, as likewise is the saying

أَنَا قَتَلْنَا بِقَتْلَانَا سَرَاتِكُمْ \* أَهْلَ الْمَوَارِثِ فَبِمَا يَكْثُرُ الْقَتْلُ

[*Verily we have slain for our slain your chiefs, (O) people of the standard: then for what (thing) does slaughter abound (among the common people)? (DM)*];

while the ordinary reading may not be attributed to that, because of its weakness, for which reason Ks refutes the

saying of the commentators that مَا in يَا لَيْتَ قَوْمِي

XXXVI. 25. 26. O would that my people knew for what my Lord hath forgiven me!

is *interrog.*, whereas it is infinitival [571], that my Lord hath etc!; and the wonder is that Z should allow it to be *interrog.* [in this text] notwithstanding his refutation

of the saying that in فَبِمَا أَغْوَيْتَنِي VII. 15. *Then foras-much as Thou hast made me to err* the sense is *Then wherefore hast Thou made etc?* by the argument that

expression of the ! [when the *prep.* is prefixed to the *interrog.* مَا (K)] is rare, anomalous. When, however,

the *interrog.* مَا is compounded with ذَا, its ! is not elided, as لَمَّا ذَا جِئْتِ For what camest thou? [186], because

its ! then becomes medial (ML). كَلَّمَا [117, 204, 571]

ought to be written conjoined when it is i. q. كَلَّ وَقَتٌ,





follow either of them except after their conjunction with مَا : but نَعَمَّا and بُشَمَّا [180, 471] are allowed to be written disjoined and conjoined, except that conjunction is preferable in نَعَمَّا, because of the concurrence of two similar letters, contrary to مَا بُشِيَ : and, when مَا is affixed to فِي, then, if it be *interrog.*, its ا is elided, and رَغِبْتَ فِيمَ *For what wishedst thou?* is written [conjoined]; whereas, if it be i. q. اَلَّذِي, you conjoin, but express its ا, writing رَغِبْتَ فِيمَا رَغِبْتَ *I wished for what thou wishedst*: and you write عَمَّا conjoined, as in XXIII. 42. [508, 565]; unless it be *interrog.*, as in عَمَّ يَتَسَاءَلُونَ LXXVIII. 1. *Of what question they among themselves?* [above], in which case it is written [conjoined, but] with elision of the ا (D).

§ 182. مَنْ is (1) *cond.*, as IV. 122. [419] : (2) *interrog.*, as مَنْ بَعَثَنَا مِنْ مَرْقَدِنَا XXXVI. 52. *Who hath roused us from our sleep?* and فَمَنْ رَبُّكُمْ يَا مُوسَى XX. 51. *Then who is your Lord, O Moses?* : (a) when مَنْ يَفْعَلُ هَذَا اِلَّا زَيْدٌ *Who does this save Zaid?* is said, it is the *interrog.* مَنْ imbued with the sense of *negation*, whence وَمَنْ يَغْفِرُ الذُّنُوبَ اِلَّا اللّٰهُ III. 129. *And who*

*forgiveth sins save God?* ; nor is the allowability of that [imbuing of the *interrog.* with *negation* (DM)] restricted to its being preceded by the و, contrary to the opinion of IM, [whose language in the Tashil, however, only imports that it is *often* preceded by the و (DM),]

as is proved by مَنْ ذَا الَّذِي يَشْفَعُ عِنْدَهُ إِلَّا بِإِذْنِهِ II. 256.

*Who is he that shall intercede with Him save by His*

*permission?*: (b) when مَنْ ذَا لَقِيتَ *Who is he (that)*

*thou didst, or Whom didst thou, meet?* is said, مَنْ is an

*inch.*, and ذَا an *enunc.*, a conjunct [186], the *rel.* being

suppressed, [i.e. لَقِيتَهُ (DM)] ; or, according to the say-

ing of the KK on the redundance of *ns.*, ذَا may be *red.*,

and مَنْ an *obj.*; while many appear to say that مَنْ and

ذَا may be compounded [into one *interrog. n.*, either (a) an

*inch.*, the *prop.* لَقِيتَ, i.e. لَقِيتَهُ, being an *enunc.*, or (b)

a *prepos. obj.* to لَقِيتَ (DM)], as in مَا ذَا صَنَعْتَ [186]:

(3) conjunct, as أَلَمْ تَرَ أَنَّ اللَّهَ يَسْجُدُ لَهُ مَنْ فِي السَّمَوَاتِ

وَمَنْ فِي الْأَرْضِ XXII. 18. *Hast thou not considered that*

*they that are in the heavens and they that are in the earth*

*bow down unto God?*: (4) a qualified *indet.*, for which

reason it (a) has رَبَّ prefixed to it in

رَبِّ مَنْ أَنْصَبْتَ غِيْطًا قَلْبُهُ \* قَدْ تَمَنَّى لِيْ مَوْتًا لَمْ يَطْع

[by Suwaid Ibn Abi Kāhil alYashkari, *Many a person whose heart I made to boil with rage did wish for me death, not, i.e. without, being gratified!* (Jsh)]; (b) is qualified by the *indet.* in such as <sup>مَرَرْتُ بِمَنْ مَعْجِبٍ لَكَ</sup> *I passed by a person pleasing to thee* [147]. <sup>فَكَفَى بِنَا آخِ</sup> [503], and

أَنِّي وَإِيَّاكَ إِذَا حَلَّتْ بِأَرْحَلِنَا  
كَمَنْ بَوَادِيَةٍ بَعْدَ الْمَحَلِّ مَطْوَرٍ

by AlFarazdak, [*Verily I and thou, when they (the she-camels) have stopped at our abodes, shall be like a person rained upon in his valley after drought* (DM)], i.e. <sup>مَنْ كَشَخَصٍ مَطْوَرٍ</sup> : (a) in II. 7. [499] many decide that <sup>مَنْ</sup> is qualified, which is improbable from the rarity of this usage; and others that it is conjunct: while Z says that, if <sup>أَل</sup> in <sup>النَّاسِ</sup> be construed to denote *knowledge*, <sup>مَنْ</sup> is conjunct, *And of the men are they that say*, like <sup>وَمِنْهُمْ</sup> IX. 61. *And of them are they that vex the Prophet*, and, if *genus*, <sup>مَنْ</sup> is qualified, [as though <sup>وَمِنْ النَّاسِ نَاسٍ يَقُولُونَ</sup> *And of men are men that say* were said (K),] like <sup>مِنْ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ رِجَالٌ صَدَقُوا</sup> XXXIII. 23. *Of believers are men that have fulfilled*; but this needs consideration. Two other kinds of <sup>مَنْ</sup> are added:— (1) a complete *indet.*, according to F, who says it of [the 2nd <sup>مَنْ</sup> in]

وَنَعْمَ مَزْكَا مِّنْ ضَاكَّتْ مَذَاهِبُهُ \* وَنَعْمَ مِّنْ هُوَ فِي سِرِّ وَأَعْلَانِ

[by AlFarazdaq, *And most excellent is the refuge of him whose ways to a livelihood have become strait, and most excellent is he as a person, he in privacy and publicity!* (Jsh)], asserting that the *ag.* is latent, مِّنْ a *sp.*, and هُوَ particularized by praise [469]; while others say that مِّنْ is conjunct, an *ag.*, هُوَ an *inch.* whose *enunc.* is another هُوَ suppressed, upon the principle of وَشِعْرِيّ and شِعْرِيّ [30], [the *prop.* being the *conj.* of مِّنْ (DM),] and the *adv.* [498] dependent upon the suppressed [هُوَ], because it contains the sense of the *v.*, i.e. وَنَعْمَ مِّنْ هُوَ اَلتَّابِتُ and most excellent is he that is (he, i. c. the steadfast) in etc.!, in which case I say that a 3rd هُوَ he particularized by praise must be supplied: (2) a *corrob.* [563], vid. [in the positions (DM)] where Ks asserts that it occurs *red.*, like مَا, that being easy according to the rule of the KK that *ns.* are made *red.*, whence فَكَفَىٰ بِنَا اَلْخ [above] over others than us, the version

يَا شَاةَ مِّنْ قَنْصٍ لِّمَنْ حَلَّتْ لَهٗ \* حُرْمَتٌ اَعْلَىٰ وَلَيْتَهَا لَمْ تَحْرِمِ

[by 'Antara, *O (people, behold a) wild cow (a met. for woman) of the chase for him that she has become lawful unto, (and marvel at her beauty and her comeliness)! She*

has become unlawful unto me, and would that she had not become unlawful ! (EM)], and the saying

أَلِ الزَّيْبِ سَنَامُ الْمَجْدِ قَدْ عَلِمَتْ  
ذَاكَ الْقَبَائِلُ وَالْأَثَرُونَ مِنْ عَدَدَا

(ML) *The family of Az Zubair Ibn Al'Awwām are the summit of glory (the tribes of the Arabs have known that), and are the most multitudinous in number (Jsh).*

مِنْ [mostly (IA)] denotes *the rational* (R, IA, Sh), as

أَفَمَنْ يَعْلَمُ إِنَّمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكَ مِنْ رَبِّكَ الْحَقُّ كَمَنْ هُوَ أَعْمَى

XIII. 19. *What! then is he that knoweth that what hath been revealed to thee from thy Lord is the truth like him that is blind?* (Sh) ; but sometimes *the irrational*, as

وَمِنْهُمْ مَنْ يَمْشِي عَلَى أَرْبَعٍ XXIV. 44. *And of them is what goeth upon four legs* (R, IA), whence

أَسْرَبَ الْفُطَا هَلْ مِنْ يَغِيرُ جَنَاحَهُ  
لَمَّا إِلَى مَنْ قَدْ هَوَيْتَ أَطِيرُ

(IA), by Al'Abbās Ibn AlAḥnaf, *O flock of Kaṭā, is he that will lend (me) his wing (present among you)? Perhaps I shall fly (with it) to her that I have loved* (J).

مِنْ [as also مَا (R)] is literally *sing. masc.*; but is applied to the [*sing.* (M),] *du.*, and *pl.*, [*masc.* (M)] and *fem.*: and, [if the *du.*, *pl.*, or *fem.* be meant by them (R),] the letter is oftener observed (M, R) in what they are expressed by, vid. the *pron.*, *dem.*, and the like (R), but



which reason <sup>نَوَّهَاجَرَهَا</sup> *We will give her her reward* is then said : and, if ambiguity would be produced by observance of the letter, observance of the sense is necessary ; so that you do not say <sup>لَقِيتُ مِنْ أَحَدٍ</sup> when you mean a *woman*, unless some [explanatory] context be there. And, because observance of the letter is more frequent and better than observance of the sense, pre-  
 dence of observance of the letter, when the two observances are combined, is more frequent than the reverse : the text says <sup>وَمَنْ يُؤْمِنْ بِاللَّهِ وَيَعْمَلْ صَالِحًا يُدْخِلْهُ جَنَّاتٍ</sup> *ومن يؤمن بالله ويعمل صالحا يدخله جنات* <sup>تَجْرِي مِنْ تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ</sup> LXV. 11. *And whoso believeth in God, and doeth good, him will He make to enter gardens beneath the trees of which flow streams* by concord with the letter, and afterwards <sup>خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا</sup> *about to abide therein for ever* by concord with the sense ; and, for the same reason, vid. that concord with the letter is better, it reverts after <sup>خَالِدِينَ أَلْخ</sup> to concord with the letter, saying <sup>قَدْ أَحْسَنَ اللَّهُ لَهُ رِزْقًا</sup> *God hath made goodly provision for him!* (R). <sup>مِنْ</sup>, when attached to <sup>كُلِّ</sup> or <sup>مَعَ</sup>, is written disjoined ; and is written conjoined only in <sup>مَعْنِي</sup> and <sup>مَعْنِي</sup>, on account of the incorporation of the <sup>ن</sup> into the <sup>م</sup>, as in <sup>عَمَّا</sup> [181] and <sup>أَمَّا</sup> [589] (D).



§ 183. When you interrogate with <sup>اَ</sup>مَنْ about a mentioned rational [185] *indet.*, and pause upon <sup>اَ</sup>مَنْ [185], (1) you may imitate in <sup>اَ</sup>مَنْ the inflection of that mentioned [*indet.*] and the signs of its *du.*, *pl.*, and *fem.*: thus you say <sup>اَ</sup>مَنْ [497], <sup>اَ</sup>مَنْ, and <sup>اَ</sup>مَنْ when <sup>اَ</sup>رَأَيْتَ, <sup>اَ</sup>جَاؤَنِي رَجُلٌ, <sup>اَ</sup>رَجُلًا, and <sup>اَ</sup>مَرَرْتُ بِرَجُلٍ are said; <sup>اَ</sup>مَنْ and <sup>اَ</sup>مَنْ when <sup>اَ</sup>رَأَيْتَ <sup>اَ</sup>رَجُلَيْنِ, <sup>اَ</sup>جَاؤَنِي رَجُلَانِ, and <sup>اَ</sup>مَرَرْتُ بِرَجُلَيْنِ are said; <sup>اَ</sup>مَنْ when <sup>اَ</sup>جَاؤَنِي مُسْلِمُونَ or <sup>اَ</sup>رِجَالٌ or <sup>اَ</sup>قَوْمٌ is said, and <sup>اَ</sup>مَنْ in the *acc.* and *gen.*; <sup>اَ</sup>مَنْ when <sup>اَ</sup>جَاؤَتْنِي ضَارِبَةٌ or <sup>اَ</sup>طَائِقٌ [268] is said, and likewise in the *acc.* and *gen.*; <sup>اَ</sup>مَنْ when <sup>اَ</sup>جَاؤَتْنِي ضَارِبَتَانِ or <sup>اَ</sup>طَائِقَانِ is said, and <sup>اَ</sup>مَنْ in the *acc.* and *gen.*; and <sup>اَ</sup>مَنْ when <sup>اَ</sup>جَاؤَتْنِي مُسْلِمَاتٌ or <sup>اَ</sup>ضَوَارِبٌ is said, and likewise in the *acc.* and *gen.*: (a) they add in the *sing. masc.* the <sup>اَ</sup>و, <sup>اَ</sup>ا, and <sup>اَ</sup>ي instead of the vowels, because, if they imitated the vowels of the *indet.* as they are, the word would be vocalized in pause, which is not allowable; so that instead of the vowels they express quiescent consonants resembling them, and put before the consonants vowels akin to them: this is the opinion of Mb; but Sf says that they express the vowels in <sup>اَ</sup>مَنْ for imitation of the inflection, as in <sup>اَ</sup>اِ [185], and

that, since the state is that of pause, and the final of the word paused upon is quiescent, they then implete the vowels, so that the consonants are engendered : and both the sayings are possible : (b) expression of the letters of prolongation indicative of the inflection not being possible in <sup>أَ</sup>مَنْكَ, since the ڤ of femininization in pause is only quiescent, they content themselves with imitating the sign of the *fem.*, and omit to imitate the inflection ; and they treat <sup>أَ</sup>مَنْات like its *sing.* in omitting to imitate its inflection, although it would be possible by putting the letters of prolongation : (c) the quiescence of the [1st] ن in <sup>أَ</sup>مَنْتَانِ and <sup>أَ</sup>مَنْتَيْنِ is a warning that the ت denotes femininization not of the word that it is affixed to, but of another word ; for which reason in what precedes it they do not keep to the mobility inseparable from what precedes the ڤ of femininization : and the ن in the *sing.* is sometimes made quiescent, as <sup>أَ</sup>مَنْت ; though it is oftener mobilized, because they add the ڤ to indicate that the question is about a *fem.*, and the fact that the ڤ is preceded by Fath and converted into ڤ in pause is more indicative of its denoting femininization, such as <sup>ڤ</sup>بَنْت and <sup>ڤ</sup>اِخْت and such as

مَا بَالُ عَيْنِي عَنْ كَرَاهَا قَدْ جَفَتْ  
 مَسْبَلَةٌ تَسْتَوِي لَهَا عَرَفَتْ

دَارًا لِسَلْمَى بَعْدَ حَوْلٍ قَدْ عَفَتْ  
بَلْ جَوَزَ تَيْهَاءَ كَظْمِ الْهَفْ

saying of the poet [AlFarazdaq, or, as some say (N),  
Sumair Ibn AlḤārith adDabbī (AAz, N),]

أَتَرَا نَارِي فَقُلْتُ مَذُونُ أَنْتُمْ \* فَقَالُوا الْجِنُّ قُلْتُ عَمُوا ظُلَامًا

[*They came to my fire, and I said, Who are ye? And they said, The Jinn. I said, May your life be pleasant in darkness!* (AAz, N)]. And Y relates that ضَرْبٌ مِنْ

مَنْ *Who beat whom?* has been heard in interrogation about the *beater* and *beaten*: but this, as S says, is improbable; and, as Y also says, is not accepted by every one, because the *v.* precedes the *interrog.* word: and, as for the inflection of the *interrog.*, it is said to be an imitation, as though the speaker had heard a man say ضَرْبَ رَجُلٍ رَجُلًا; whereas the fact appears to be that it is not an imita-

tion, but that in some *dials.* مَنْ may be *infl.* not by way of imitation, as you see in أَنْتُمْ مَذُونُ, which is not imitated as Y asserts, since there is no *indet.* mentioned before

it. The signs mentioned are not affixed to مَنْ except at the end of the sentence, because they are in the state of pause; so that, when امْرَأَةٌ رَجُلًا or امْرَأَةٌ رَجُلًا رَأَيْتَ or امْرَأَةٌ رَجُلًا رَأَيْتَ and امْرَأَتَانِ رَجُلَيْنِ are said, you say مَنْ وَمَنْ or مَنْ وَمَنْ and مَنْ وَمَنْ, and so on. When the rational and irrational are combined, you put the question about the rational with مَنْ, and about the irrational with أَيْ,

as <sup>لَقَيْتُ رَجُلًا</sup> <sup>مِنْ</sup> <sup>وَأَيُّنِ</sup> <sup>أَسْأَلُ</sup> *Whom and which two?* when <sup>وَحَمَارَيْنِ</sup> is said. *Dets.* after <sup>مِنْ</sup> are (1) not proper names, in which case there are three methods:—(a) most commonly there is no imitation in them, nor in <sup>مِنْ</sup> after their suppression; (b) Mb transmits from Y that they are mentioned after <sup>مِنْ</sup> imitated, like proper names [below], so that, when a man says <sup>رَأَيْتُ أَخَا زَيْدٍ</sup>, you say <sup>مِنْ</sup> <sup>أَخَا زَيْدٍ</sup>, which S allows, though not as matter of choice, but like <sup>دَعْنَا</sup> <sup>مِنْ</sup> [1, 185] and <sup>لَيْسَ بِقُرْشِيَا</sup>; (c) they are suppressed, while the signs of imitation are expressed in <sup>مِنْ</sup>, as in the case of *indet.*, because the *det.* mentioned is unknown to the hearer, like the *indet.*, as S relates that, when <sup>مَعَ مَنِيْنِي</sup> <sup>قَدْ</sup> <sup>رَأَيْتُهُ</sup> and <sup>نَهَبْتُ</sup> <sup>مَعَهُم</sup> are said, <sup>مَعَ مَنِيْنِي</sup> and <sup>مَنَا</sup> are said: (2) proper names, in which case there are two methods:—(a) the people of AlHijāz imitate the proper name after <sup>مِنْ</sup> upon certain conditions: (a) the [proper name] questioned about must not be qualified, corroborated, or followed by a *subst.* or *synd. expl.*, because the repetition of these *ants.* with their *apposs.* enables the imitation of their inflection to be dispensed with, since the person addressed knows that the person questioned about is the one mentioned, being guided to him by the repetition of the identical *apposs. men-*

tioned ; so that, when <sup>رَايْتُ زَيْدًا الطَّرِيفَ</sup> or <sup>زَيْدًا نَفْسَهُ</sup> or <sup>زَيْدًا أبا مُحَمَّدٍ</sup> is said, you say <sup>مَنْ زَيْدٌ الطَّرِيفُ</sup> or <sup>زَيْدٌ</sup> or <sup>زَيْدٌ أَبُو مُحَمَّدٍ</sup> or <sup>نَفْسَهُ</sup> with the *nom.* : though, if it be qualified by <sup>أَبْنِ</sup>, and its Tanwīn be dropped, imitation of it is not disallowed according to the people of AlḤijāz, because this qualified with this *qual.* is treated like one *n.*, as is proved by the elision of the Tanwīn from the qualified [609] and by the qualified's being governed in the *acc.* in the *voc.* [50] ; so that, when <sup>رَايْتُ زَيْدَ بْنَ عَمْرٍو</sup> is said, you say <sup>مَنْ زَيْدٌ بْنُ عَمْرٍو</sup> with the *acc.* ; whereas, if <sup>مَنْ زَيْدٌ ابْنُ أَخِي عَمْرٍو</sup> be said, you say <sup>مَنْ زَيْدٌ ابْنِ</sup> with the *nom.* : (b) the coupled without repetition of <sup>مَنْ</sup> is like the rest of the *apposs.*, according to Y, as respects disallowance of imitation with it, whether both be proper names or one of them : but S transmits from some people (and approves of it) that imitation is allowable when the *ant.* is a proper name, whether the coupled be a proper name or not, as <sup>مَنْ زَيْدًا وَعَمْرًا</sup> or <sup>مَنْ زَيْدًا وَآخَا عَمْرٍو</sup> when <sup>لَقِيتُ زَيْدًا وَعَمْرًا</sup> or <sup>زَيْدًا وَآخَا عَمْرٍو</sup> is said, the question being put with the single [*ant.*] *n.*, which is then coupled to after the imitation ; whereas, if the *ant.* be not a proper name, as when <sup>مَرَرْتُ بِأَخِيكَ وَزَيْدٍ</sup> is said, imitation is not allowable in the question by com-

mon consent, but the *nom.* is necessary, because the *ant.* may not be imitated, and similarly therefore the *appos.* :

(c) if <sup>^</sup>مَنْ be repeated in the coupled, as <sup>^</sup>مَنْ <sup>^</sup>زَيْدًا <sup>^</sup>وَمَنْ <sup>^</sup>مَنْ, <sup>^</sup>مَنْ <sup>^</sup>أَخُوهُ <sup>^</sup>وَمَنْ <sup>^</sup>زَيْدًا <sup>^</sup>وَمَنْ <sup>^</sup>مَنْ or <sup>^</sup>مَنْ <sup>^</sup>أَخُوهُ <sup>^</sup>وَمَنْ <sup>^</sup>زَيْدًا <sup>^</sup>وَمَنْ <sup>^</sup>مَنْ, imitation is allowable in the proper name, but not in what is not a proper name, because, the 2nd being plainly disconnected from the 1st, each of the *ant.* and coupled has its own predicament, as though it were alone : (d) a *con.* must not be prefixed to <sup>^</sup>مَنْ, as in <sup>^</sup>فَمَنْ <sup>^</sup>زَيْدًا <sup>^</sup>وَمَنْ <sup>^</sup>مَنْ or <sup>^</sup>فَمَنْ <sup>^</sup>زَيْدًا <sup>^</sup>وَمَنْ <sup>^</sup>مَنْ, where imitation is not allowable by common consent, because of the cessation of ambiguity, since the coupling to the sentence of the person addressed notifies that the question is only about the person mentioned by him : (e) the cognomen may be imitated by common consent; but there is a dispute about the surname, which properly may be imitated, because it also is a proper name [4] ; and similarly the imitation of the *du.* and *pl.* of the proper name is disputed, the allowers looking to its *sing.*, and the disallowers to the cessation of the quality of proper name on account of the dualization and pluralization [171] : (f) when what follows <sup>^</sup>مَنْ is imitated, <sup>^</sup>مَنْ is in the position of a *nom.* by inchoation : and what follows it, if a *nom.*, is so by imitation, not as an *enunc.*, the sign of the *nom.* due to the quality of *enunc.* being supplied in it ; and, if an *acc.* or *gen.*, is in the position of a *nom.* as an *enunc.* ; so that each is an *infl.* [n.]

in the position of a *nom.*, whose inflection [as an *enunc.*] is impossible through the preoccupation of its place by a vowel imported for imitation [185]: (g) suppression of the proper name after مَنْ and expression of the sign of imitation in the latter sometimes occur: thus, خَلَفَ دَارَ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ Behind the door of 'Abd Allah having been said, the hearer said دَارَ مَنْزِلِي The house of whom?: (b) the Banū Tamīm treat the proper name in interrogation about it with مَنْ like other *ns.*, putting it in the *nom.* in every case by inchoation. When you question with مَنْ about a *rel. ep.* of a proper name, then, (1) if the *ep.* relate to what is rational, whether the related proper name be rational or not, as when لَقِيتَ زَيْدًا or رَكِبْتَ رَكَبَتَهُ [6] is said, you may say الْمَنْيَ, meaning, e. g., The Bakrī or the Kurashī?: (a) you put مَنْ in place of the *rel. ep.*; and prefix أَلْ to مَنْ, because it would be so in the *rel. ep.* questioned about, e. g. الْبَكْرِيَّ, since the *rel. ep.* of the proper name must contain أَل; and affix the ي of relation at the end of مَنْ, as it would be at the end of the *rel. ep.* questioned about; and most commonly prefix the *interrog.* Hamza to أَل saying أَلْمَنْيَ with prolongation, because it would be so in the *rel. ep.* questioned about, since





irrational, like <sup>و</sup>المَكِّيّ *The Meccan* and <sup>و</sup>البَصْرِيّ *The Basṭī*,  
<sup>و</sup>الْمَنِيّ is not allowable by common consent (R).

§ 184. <sup>ء</sup>اِى is (1) *cond.*, as XVII. 110. [116, 565]  
 and <sup>ء</sup>اِىْمَا <sup>ء</sup>الْاِجْلِيَيْنِ <sup>ء</sup>قَضِيْتُ <sup>ء</sup>فَلَا <sup>ء</sup>عِدَاوَى <sup>ء</sup>عَلَى XXVIII. 28.  
*Whichever* [181, 565] *of the two terms I fulfil, no in-*  
*justice shall be done upon me*, [which is also read <sup>ء</sup>اِىْمَا { with  
*quiescence of the* <sup>ء</sup>ى (K) }, like <sup>ء</sup>تَنْظَرْتُ <sup>ء</sup>اَنْخ (below) (K,  
 B)]: (2) *interrog.*, as <sup>ء</sup>اِىْمَانَا <sup>ء</sup>هَذِهِ <sup>ء</sup>زَادَتْهُ <sup>ء</sup>اِىْمَانَا IX. 125.  
*Which of you is such that this Chapter hath increased*  
*him in belief?* and <sup>ء</sup>فَبِأَيِّ <sup>ء</sup>حَدِيثٍ <sup>ء</sup>بَعْدَهُ <sup>ء</sup>يُؤْمِنُونَ VII. 184.  
*Then in what story after it will they believe?*; which is  
 sometimes abbreviated, as

<sup>ء</sup>تَنْظَرْتُ <sup>ء</sup>نَصْرًا <sup>ء</sup>وَالسَّمَائِيَيْنِ <sup>ء</sup>اِيهِمَا  
<sup>ء</sup>عَلَى <sup>ء</sup>مِنَ <sup>ء</sup>الْغَيْثِ <sup>ء</sup>اسْتَهْلَيْتُ <sup>ء</sup>مَوَاطِرَهُ

[by AlFarazdak, *I gazed at Nasr and the two stars named*  
*Simāk that I might know which of them two was such*  
*that his showers of rain poured plentifully upon me* (N)]:  
 (3) *conjunct*, as <sup>ء</sup>ثُمَّ <sup>ء</sup>لَنْفَزَعَنِي <sup>ء</sup>مِنْ <sup>ء</sup>كُلِّ <sup>ء</sup>شَيْعَةٍ <sup>ء</sup>اِيهِم <sup>ء</sup>اَشَى <sup>ء</sup>عَلَى  
<sup>ء</sup>اَلرَّحْمَنِ <sup>ء</sup>عَتِيَا XIX. 70. *Then We will surely drag forth*  
*from every sect him of them (that) is most hardened in re-*  
*bellion against the Compassionate* [176, 177], i. e. <sup>ء</sup>النَّبَى هُوَ

اشد, says S: (4) indicative of the sense of *perfection*, in which case it occurs as (a) an *ep.* of the *indet.*, as زید رجل ای رجل *Zaid is a man, what a man!*, i. e. *perfect in the qualities of men*; (b) a *d. s.* to the *det.*, as مررت بعبید الله ای رجل *I passed by 'Abd Allāh, what a man!*: (5) a connective to the vocation of what contains ال, as یا ایها الرجل [48, 51, 552]. And Akh adds a [6th (DM)] kind, vid. a qualified *indet.*, as مررت بای مررت *[I passed by a person pleasing to thee (DM)]*, like بمن معجب لک [182]; but this [kind (DM)] is unheard [147]. ای is not decidedly [i. e. literally and constructively (DM)] aprothetic [116, 176] except in vocation [51] and imitation [185] (ML). ای is *infl.*, alone among conjuncts, subject to the dispute on اللذان [176], اللتان, and the تآی, and alone among *interrogs.* and *conds.*, because of its inseparability from prothesis, which makes the quality of *n.* preponderate: so that, when the *post. n.* is suppressed, then, if it be not supplied, ای is not *infl.*, as in vocation; but, if it be supplied, ای remains *infl.*, as in XVII. 110. [116]; except in کاین [226], where it is cut off from prothesis notwithstanding its inflection, because it is like the



i. e. <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> (FA)]: but some of the Arabs inflect <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> in all its states (IM, Sh), <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> being read with the *acc.* [176] (IA, Sh) by Hārūn, [Ṭalḥa Ibn Musarrif (K),] Mu‘ādh [Ibn Muslim alHarrá (K)], and Ya‘kūb (Sh), and <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> related with the *gen.* [176] (IA); and this, says S, is an excellent *dial.* (Sh). Ks says that the *op.* of the conjunct <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> must be future; and, according to the KK, its *op.* must also precede it: but the BB disagree with them in both cases, from the lack of proof in both assertions.

§ 185. When you interrogate with <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> about a mentioned *indet.*, (1) you may imitate in <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> the inflection [of that *indet.*] and the signs of the *du.*, *pl.*, and *fem.*, as in <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> [183], except that you do not affix the letters of prolongation to the *sing. masc.*, but in continuity inflect it with the vowels, as <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup>, <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup>, and <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup>, and in pause make its <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> quiescent in the *nom.* and *gen.*, and convert the Tanwīn into <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> in the *acc.* [640], because <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> is *infl.*: (a) thus two conditions of imitation with <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> are dropped in the case of <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup>, vid. reason and pause, reason because <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> is in its original constitution applicable to the rational and irrational, contrary to <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> [182]; and pause because, <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> <sup>أَفْضَلُ</sup> being *infl.*, the imitation of the inflection is not disap-

proved upon it either in continuity or in pause, whereas, <sup>أَ</sup>مِنْ being *uninfl.*, they try to keep it away from inflection, and therefore express the signs only in a state where there is mostly no inflection or Tanwīn of declinability upon the word, vid. the state of pause, where the word is divested of the sign of the *nom.* and *gen.* and of the Tanwīn: (2) you may restrict yourself in continuity to inflecting <sup>وَعَ</sup>أَي in the *sing.*, saying <sup>أَيَا</sup>أَي, <sup>وَعَ</sup>أَيَا, and <sup>وَعَ</sup>أَي in the *sing.*, *du.*, and *pl.*, *masc.* and *fem.* The vowels affixed to <sup>وَعَ</sup>أَي in the state of imitation are explained as being its inflection, in which case it is an *inch.* whose *enunc.* is suppressed, an *obj.* whose *v.* is suppressed, or a *gen.* whose *prep.* is understood: but this is weak, because subaudition of the *prep.* is rare, extraordinary [515], while dualization and pluralization of <sup>وَعَ</sup>أَي without imitation are also of weak authority [176]; and it should rather be said, as in the case of <sup>أَ</sup>مِنْ [183], that these signs are imitative alliterations to the speaker's expression, and that the place of both [ <sup>أَ</sup>مِنْ and <sup>وَعَ</sup>أَي ] is that of a *nom.* by inchoation, the full phrase being <sup>أَ</sup>مِنْ هُوَ <sup>وَعَ</sup>أَي *Who (is he)?* and <sup>وَعَ</sup>أَي هُوَ, i. e. <sup>وَعَ</sup>أَي رَجُلٌ هُوَ *What (man is he)?* When you question with <sup>وَعَ</sup>أَي about *dets.*, there is no dispute that what follows it is not imitated; so that, when <sup>أَ</sup>رَأَيْتَ زَيْدًا and <sup>أَ</sup>مَرَرْتُ بِزَيْدٍ are said, you say



*What is that which your Lord hath revealed?* مَنْ ذَا<sup>أ</sup> أَقْبَيْتَ<sup>أ</sup> (182), and

وَقَصِيدَةٌ تَأْتِي الْمُلُوكَ غَرِيبَةً \* قَدْ قُلْتَهَا لِيُقَالَ مَنْ ذَا قَالَهَا<sup>أ</sup>  
(Sh) *And many an ode, that comes to kings, marvellous, have I composed, that it might be said, Who is he that composed it?* (Jsh)] : (2) that ذَا<sup>أ</sup> be not made otiose by being compounded with مَا [or مَنْ (IA)] into one [interrog. (IA)] *n.* (IA, Sh), as مَا ذَا صَنَعْتَ<sup>أ</sup> *What hast thou done?* [182], مَا ذَا<sup>أ</sup> being treated as equivalent to أَي شَيْءٍ<sup>أ</sup>, so that it is a *prepos. obj.*; whereas, if you construe مَا to be an *inch.*, and ذَا an *enunc.*, ذَا is conjunct, *What is that which thou hast done?* because it is not made otiose (Sh). مَا ذَا<sup>أ</sup> occurs in [6 (DM)] several ways:—(1) مَا is *interrog.*, and ذَا a *dem.*, as in

مَا ذَا الْكَوْفُ عَلَى نَارٍ وَقَدْ خَمِدَتْ<sup>أ</sup>  
يَا طَالَمَا أَوْقَدْتَ فِي الْكَرْبِ نِيرَانُ<sup>أ</sup>

[*What is this standing by a fire of war when it has sunk low? O long have fires been kindled in war!* (Jsh)] : (2) مَا is *interrog.*, and ذَا conjunct, as in

أَلَا تَسْأَلَنِ الْمَرْءَ مَا ذَا يُحَاوِلُ<sup>أ</sup>  
أَنْتَسِبُ فَيَقْضَى أَمْ ضَلَالٌ وَبَاطِلُ<sup>أ</sup>



by Labīd, [*Will not ye two ask man what is that (which) he is seeking? A vow, so that it may be fulfilled, or error and vanity?* i. e. <sup>يُحَاوِلُ</sup> (Jsh)]; and preferably in the reading [of Abū ‘Amr (B)] <sup>يَسْأَلُونَكَ مَاذَا يُنْفِقُونَ قُلْ</sup> II. 216. 217. *And they will ask thee what is that (which) they shall expend. Say thou, (That which they shall expend is) the superfluous,* i. e. <sup>الَّذِي يُنْفِقُونَهُ الْعَفْوُ</sup>, since the general rule is that the nominal [*prop.* (DM)] should be answered by the nominal, and the verbal by the verbal: (3) <sup>مَاذَا</sup> is all of it a *comp. interrog.*, as in <sup>لِمَاذَا جِئْتُ</sup> [181] and

<sup>يَا خُزْرُ تَغْلِبُ مَاذَا بَالُ نِسْوَتِكُمْ</sup>  
<sup>لَا يَسْتَفْقِنُ إِلَى الدَّيْرَيْنِ تَحَنُّنًا</sup>

[by Jarīr, *O small-eyed ones of Taghlib, what is the case of your women? They recover not from longing for the two Convents of the Christians* (Jsh)]; and preferably in the reading of others than Abū ‘Amr <sup>قُلْ الْعَفْوُ</sup> II. 217. *what they shall expend. Say thou, (They shall expend) the superfluous,* [because then the answer agrees with the question in being verbal (DM),] i. e. <sup>يُنْفِقُونَ</sup>, i. e. <sup>مَاذَا</sup> (4): <sup>الْعَفْوُ</sup> is all of it a *n.* [indicative (DM)] of genus, i. q. <sup>شَيْءٌ</sup>, or a conjunct [*n.* (DM)], i. q. <sup>الَّذِي</sup>, according to different opinions upon the explanation of

دَعِيَ مَا ذَا عَلِمْتُ سَاتِقِيهِ \* وَلَكِنْ بِالْمَغِيبِ نَبِّئِنِي

[by AlMuthakḳib al'Abdi, *Leave thou alone a thing (that), or that (which), I have known—I shall guard against it—but acquaint thou me with the hidden, i. e. عَلِمْتُ (Jsh)*], where the majority hold that مَا ذَا is all of it the *obj.* of دَعِيَ, but afterwards differ, Sf and IKh saying that it is a conjunct, i. q. الَّذِي; and F that it is a [qualified (DM)] *indet.*, i. q. شَيْءٌ : (5) مَا is *red.*, and ذَا a *dem.*, as in انْزِلُوا الْخُفُوفَ [565], *orig.* سُرْعَ, where F says that ذَا may be *ag.* of سُرْعَ, and مَا *red.*; or that ذَا may be all of it a *n.*, as in دَعِيَ الْخُفُوفَ, [though here it is a *dem.*, and there a conjunct (DM) or *indet.*]: (6) مَا is *interrog.*, and ذَا *red.*, allowed by many, among them IM, in such as مَا ذَا صَنَعْتَ [above]; but upon this supposition the ا ought to be necessarily elided in such as لَمْ ذَا جِئْتُ [181], and the truth is that *ns.* are not made *red.* (ML). And [there is a 7th way, for] ذَا sometimes occurs *red.* after the conjunct مَا, as دَعِيَ مَا ذَا الْخُفُوفَ [above] *that (which) I have known* (R).

---

## THE VERBAL NOUNS AND EJACULATIONS.

§ 187. The verbal *n.* is that [*n.* (Jm)] which is in the sense of the *imp.* or *pret.* (IH). It is that [expression (IA)] which acts as a substitute for the *v.* (IM, Fk) in [sense and (IA)] government (IA, A), but which is not impressible by the *ops.* [159], nor superfluous (A, Fk). The 1st restriction excludes the *inf. n.* occurring as a substitute for expression of the *v.*, [as in ضَرَبًا زَيْدًا (41) (Sn),] the *act. part.*, [as in أَقَامَ الزَّيْدَانِ (24) (Sn),] and the like; and the 2nd excludes the *ps.* (A), like اَنَّ and its sisters [516] (Sn). The verbal *n.* is [of 3 sorts (Sh),] (1) i. q. the *imp.*, most often, [like دَع i. q. بَلَّ as تَذَرُ النَّحْلَ (192) in the version with the *acc.*, الزَّمَّة i. q. عَلَيْكَ as V. 104. (44), دَوْنَكُمْ i. q. خَذَلْ, and رَوَيْدَةً or تَيْدَةً i. q. امْهَلْ (Sh)]: (2) i. q. the *pret.*, [more often than the *aor.* (Sh),] like هَيَّاهُ i. q. بَعْدَ, [as

فَهَيَّاهُ هَيَّاهُ الْعَقِيقُ وَمَنْ بِهِ  
وَهَيَّاهُ خَلْ بِالْعَقِيقِ نَوَاصِلَهُ

(Sh), by Jarīr, *Then far, far off* (22) are *Al' Akkik* (a place) and *he that is therein! And far off is a friend that in Al' Akkik we shall be united with!* (Jsh),] and اِفْتَرَقَ i. q. شَتَانِ, [as

شَتَانْ هَذَا وَالْعِنَاقِ وَالذَّرْمِ

وَالْمَشْرَبِ الْبَارِدِ فِي ظِلِّ الدَّرْمِ

(Sh), by ALA'shà, *Different are this and embracing and sleeping and the cool drinking-place in the shade of the fan-palm!* (AAz)]: (3) i. q. the aor., like أَوَدَّ i. q. أَتَوَجَّعُ (IA, Sh), أَدَّى i. q. أَعْجَبَ (IA), and أَفَّ i. q. أَتَضَجَّرُ; but some drop this division (Sh). The verbal ns. are [all (IA)] *uninfl.* (R, IA, Sh) upon quiescence, like صَمَةٌ and مَمَةٌ; Fath, like آمِينَ; Kasr, like أَيْعَ; or Damm, like هَيْتَ (Sh): (1) because of their resemblance [in sense] to the *orig. uninfl.*, vid. the *pret.* and *imp. v.* [159]; and [accordingly] we do not say that صَمَةٌ is i. q. لَا تَتَكَلَّمْ *Speak not* and مَمَةٌ i. q. لَا تَفْعَلْ *Do not*, since, if so, they would be *infl.*, but that they are i. q. أَسْكُتْ *Be silent* and أَكْفُفْ *Forbear*; nor that أَفَّ is i. q. أَتَضَجَّرُ *I am disgusted* and أَوَدَّ i. q. أَتَوَجَّعُ *I am pained*, since, if so, they would be *infl.*, but that they are i. q. the originative تَضَجَّرْتُ and تَوَجَّعْتُ: (2) as may be said, because they are ns. denoting what is *orig. uninfl.*, vid. the unrestricted *v.* [159], whether it remain in that *o. f.*, like the *pret.* and *imp.*, or become excluded from it, like the *aor.* [402, 404]; and, according to this, the excuse mentioned [for the rendering of صَمَةٌ, etc.] is

not needed (R): (3) as before said [159], because of their resemblance to the *p.* in acting as a substitute for the *v.* and not being impressible [by the *op.*] (IA). According to the correct opinion (Fk), the meaning of the term “verbal *ns.*” is that (IY) they are applied to indicate verbal *expressions* (IY, Fk), as *ns.* indicate their denominates; so that هَيْهَات is a *n.* indicating the expression بَعْدُ, and similarly the rest. The object of using them is abbreviation and abridgment and a sort of intensiveness; and, were it not for that, the *vs.* denoted by these *ns.* would be more fit for their position. The manner of the abridgment in them is that they occur uniform for all genders and numbers, as زَيْدٌ or يَا زَيْدٌ or هُنْدٌ or زَيْدَانِ or هُنْدَانِ or زَيْدُونَ or هُنْدَاتٌ; and, as for the intensiveness, صَهْ Hush! is more intensive in meaning than اَسْكُتْ Be silent, and similarly the rest. As for their indicating what *vs.* indicate, vid. *command*, *prohibition*, and the particular *time*, this meaning is imported only from what is indicated by them, not from themselves (IY): so that صَهْ [is a *n.* which (YS)] indicates [the expression (YS)] اَسْكُتْ (IY, YS), while the *command* is understood from the denominate, vid. اَسْكُتْ; and هَيْهَات is a *n.*, the denominate of which is another expression, vid. بَعْدُ, so that the *time* is known from the denominate, not from the *n.* (IY). But R says [below] that this is of no account: and the

verbal *n.* is variously said (1) to indicate the *inf. n.*, in which case a distinction between the verbal *n.* and *inf. n.* is needed, since the verbal *n.* is *uninfl.*, and the *inf. n.* *infl.* ; (2) to indicate the *accident* and *time* that the *v.* indicates [402], except that the *v.* indicates *time* by the form, and the verbal *n.* by application ; (3) to be really a *v.* (YS). What induces the GG to say that these words and their likes are not *vs.*, notwithstanding that they convey the sense of *vs.*, is a *lit.* matter, vid. that their forms are different from those of *vs.*, that they are not conjugable like *vs.*, that the ج [2] is prefixed to some of them [200] and the Tanwīn affixed to others [198], and that some of them are obviously *advs.* and others *preps.* and *gens.* [199]. As for their *o. fs.*, and what they are transferred from, (1) some of them are obviously transferred from *inf. ns.* and *advs.* [or *preps* and *gens.*], as رَوَيْتَ زَيْدًا [188], بَلَغَ زَيْدًا [192], فَدَاكَ لَكَ الْأَقْوَامُ [198], اِمَامَكَ زَيْدًا Take Zaid [but see § 199], orig. اِمَامَكَ زَيْدًا فَتَحْنَهُ فَقَدْ اِمْكَنْكَ Before thee is Zaid: then take him, for it has become in thy power [to do so], and عَلَيْكَ عَمْرًا [199], since these words are often used according to their original construction, as رَوَيْتَ زَيْدًا and بَلَغَ زَيْدًا with prothesis, فَدَاكَ لَكَ with the *nom.* [as a *prepos.* *enunc.* (IY)] or *acc.* [as an *inf. n.* (IY)], and اِمَامَكَ زَيْدًا with the *nom.* : (2) some of them seem to have been *orig. inf. ns.*,

though they are not actually used as *inf. ns.*, as وَشَكَّانَ ,  
 سَرَّعَانَ , بَطَّانَ , and شَتَّانَ , like لَيَّانَ , هَيَّهَاتَ like قَوْقَاةَ ,  
 نَزَالِ like فَجَّارِ , and تَيِّفَ like ضَرْبَ : (3) some of them are ap-  
 parently *ejs.* transferred to [the *cat.* of] *inf. ns.*, and thence  
 to [that of] verbal *ns.*, the *ejs.* transferred to the *cat.* of  
*inf. ns.* being of two kinds, (a) permanent *inf. ns.*, which  
 do not become verbal *ns.*, as دَعْدَعًا , لَعَا , رَاهَا , وَهَيَّا ,  
 وَيَلِكُ , وَيَسْكُ , وَيَحْكُ , and رَى لِعَمْرٍو ; (b) transferred  
 from the *cat.* of *inf. ns.* to that of verbal *ns.*, as ضَهَّ ,  
 هَيَّكُ , هَيَّيْكَ , اِيَّهَ , حَيَّ , هَلَّا , هَيَّا , دَعَّ , هَا , مَهَّ ,  
 هَيْتَ : whereas اَخَّ , كَفَّ , اَفَّ , اَوَّهَ , and بَغَّ , when not  
 used as *inf. ns.* by being either governed in the *acc.*, as  
 اَفَّا [198], or explained by the *p.*, as اَفَّ لَكَ [200], are  
 more properly said to remain *ejs.*, and not to become  
*inf. ns.* or verbal *ns.*, from the absence of indication of it ;  
 just as فَرَطَكَ Advance. or Be on thy guard from thy  
 front, بَعْدَكَ Be on thy guard from thy back, دَنَرَكَ عَمْرًا  
 or دَنَارَكَ Beware of 'Amr, and اَلْجَاذَكَ Make haste !  
 [560], are more properly said to retain the quality of  
*inf. n.*, since there is no indication of their transfer to  
 the *cat.* of verbal *ns.* Thus the verbal *ns.* are proved  
 to be all transferred from original *inf. ns.*, from *inf. ns.*  
 orig. *ejs.*, from *advs.*, or from *preps.* and *gens.* As for

أَمِينٌ, it is said to be Syriac, of foreign measure,  
 قَائِلُ Cain and هَائِلُ Abel, meaning كَذَا, and  
 made a verbal *n.* i. q. لِيَكُنْ كَذَا So be it!, and *uninfl.* i.  
 Fath; and to be sometimes lightened by elision of the *h*  
 as أَمِينٌ upon the measure of كَرِيم : but there is nothing  
 to prevent its being said to be *orig.* abbreviated  
 afterwards prolonged; and in that case it is Arabic, and  
 an *inf. n.*, like نَذِير and نَكِير, and afterwards made  
 verbal *n.* (R). You say أَمِينٌ, as says the poet

عَنِّي فَطَاحِلُ وَأَبْنُ عَمِّهِ \* أَمِينُ فَرَادَ اللَّهُ مَا بَيْنَنَا بَعْدًا

[Fathal and the son of his paternal uncle have  
 aloof from me. So be it! Then God increase what  
 between us in distance! (N)]; and, if you please, أَمِينُ,  
 as says the poet [AlMajnūn (N)]

يَا رَبِّ لَا تُسَلِّبْنِي حُبَّهَا أَبَدًا \* وَيَرْحَمِ اللَّهُ عَبْدًا قَالِ آمِينَ

[O my Lord, do not Thou ever deprive me of her love :  
 and God have mercy upon : servant that has said  
 "Amen!" (N)]: but do not double the *م* for it is wrong  
 (Th). By analogy the verbal *n.* that is *orig.* a *prep.* and  
*gen.*, as إِلَيْكَ and عَلَيْكَ, should not be called a verbal  
*n.*, because we call an expression like صَدَقَ and رَوَيْتُ a *n.*  
 from regard to its *o. f.*, whereas the *prep.* and *gen.* are



at a *n.*; but they apply this name universally to every expression occasionally transferred to the meaning of *v.*, so that **كُذِبَ** in such as **كُذِبَ الْعَتِيقُ** [below] may be called a verbal *n.* (R). The correct opinion is that the verbal *n.* has no place in inflection [159, 199] &c.). Some assert that the verbal *ns.* are *nom.* in origin, as *inchs.* having no *enunc.*, as in **أَقَامَ الزَّيْدَانِ** [below]; but this is of no account, because **أَقَامَ**, though it resembles the *v.*, has the meaning of the *n.*, i. e. **ذُو قِيَامٍ**, so that it may be an *inch.*, contrary to the verbal *n.*, in which the quality of *n.* has no meaning; and no regard is paid to the letter, since **تَسْمَعُ** in **أَخِ تَسْمَعُ**, though generally a *v.*, is an *inch.*, because it has the meaning of the *n.* [2]. The verbal *n.* then is like the **ك** of **ذَلِكَ** [172], and like the distinctive [166] according to those who say that it is a *p.*: each of these two had a place in inflection, because of their being *ns.*; but, since they have been transferred to the meaning of the *p.*, they do not retain that [place], because the *p* has no inflection: and similarly the verbal *n.* had *orig.* a place in inflection; but, since it has been transferred to the meaning of the *v.*, and the *v.* has *orig.* no place in inflection, it also does not retain a place in inflection. Nor is what some mention, vid. that the verbal *ns.* are *acc.* in position as *inf. ns.*, of any account, since, if they were so, the *vs.* would be supplied before them [41], so that they

would not act as substitutes for the *v.*, and therefore would not be *uninfl.*: nor do we say that <sup>أَمَّا</sup> i. q. <sup>تَقْدِمُ</sup> [199] is governed in the *acc.* by a supplied *v.* [498], but the sign of the *acc.* in it becomes like the Fath of the <sup>ف</sup> in <sup>جَعْفَرُ</sup>; nor that <sup>أَلَيْكَ</sup> and <sup>عَلَيْكَ</sup>, when verbal *ns.*, are *preps.* dependent upon a supplied [*v.*]; but the *pre.* and *post.* in the 1st, and the *prep.* and *gen.* in the 2nd, become like one word. Thus the *inf. n.* and *ej.*, when verbal *ns.*, become like <sup>بَيْتُ</sup> [4] and <sup>الْفَضْلُ</sup> when proper names of a person; and the *pre.* and <sup>عَبْدُ</sup> <sup>اللَّهِ</sup> and the *prep.* and *gen.*, when verbal *ns.*, become like <sup>تَابِعُ</sup> <sup>شَرًّا</sup> and <sup>تَابِعُ</sup> <sup>شَرًّا</sup> when proper names: so that they are transferred from their original meanings to the meaning of the *v.* in the same way as proper names are transferred. And what some say [above], vid. that <sup>صَ</sup> e. g. is a *n.* denoting the expression <sup>أَسْكُتَ</sup>, which is indicative of the meaning of the *v.*, so that <sup>صَ</sup> is a proper name for the expression of the *v.*, not for its meaning, is of no account, since the pure Arab sometimes says <sup>صَ</sup> notwithstanding that the expression <sup>أَسْكُتَ</sup> does not occur to his mind, and perhaps has never been heard by him at all; while, if you said that it was a *n.* denoting <sup>أَصْمَتَ</sup> or <sup>أَمْتَنَعَ</sup> <sup>مِنَ الْكَلَامِ</sup> or anything else that conveyed this meaning, it would be correct: so that we know that what is intended is the meaning, not the

expression. And sometimes the *v.* becomes a verbal *n.*, as in the saying of 'Antara

كَذَبَ الْعَتِيقُ وَمَاءَ شَيْ بَارِدًا  
 إِنْ كُنْتَ سَأَلْتَنِي غُبُوقًا فَذَهَبِي

*Take wine and cold water of a waterskin : if thou be asking me for an evening-draught of milk, get thee gone,* when related with الْعَتِيقُ in the *acc.*; and similarly in the saying of him who on looking at an emaciated he-camel said to its owner كَذَبَ عَلَيْكَ الْبِزْرُ وَالذَّوَى *Keep to, and Take, seeds and date-stones* with الْبِزْرُ in the *acc.*: IS says that Mudar make it govern the *acc.*, and AlYaman the *nom.*; for كَذَبَ عَلَيْكَ الْبِزْرُ means الزَّهْمَةُ and خَذَةُ, because, *lying* being held by them to be extremely disgraceful, and an act whose author the person lied against is instigated to *keep to* and *seize*, كَذَبَ فَلَانٌ *Such a one has lied* comes to mean an *instigation to keep to him*, i. e. *Keep to, and Seize, him, for he is a liar*; and, when conjoined with عَلَيْكَ, it becomes more intensive in instigation, as though you said *He has forged against thee ; therefore seize him*; and afterwards it is used in instigating to *keep to* every thing, even if it be not such as *lying* proceeds from, as in the saying [of 'Umar to 'Amr Ibn Ma'dikarib, when the latter complained to him of pain in the sinews from walking (D),]

كُذِّبَ عَلَيْكَ الْعَسَلُ keep to trotting, i. e. بِالْعَسَلَانِ ,  
and in the saying of the poet

وَذِيَابَنِيَّةٍ أَرَصَتْ بَنِيهَا • بَانَ كُذِّبَ الْقَرَّاطِقُ وَالْقُرُوفُ

[And (many) a Dhubyānī (woman was there) that  
enjoined her sons to keep to, i. e. take care of, the coats  
and leathern cases (N)], i. e. عَلَيْكُمْ بِهَا , and in كُذِّبَ الْحَجُّ  
Keep to the pilgrimage, i. e. عَلَيْكَ ; so that, as عَلَيْكَ  
and إِلَيْكَ , becoming i. q. the *imp. v.* [199], may govern  
the *acc.*, so كُذِّبَ and كُذِّبَ عَلَيْكَ , becoming i. q. the  
*imp.*, may govern the *acc.*, as الزَّمُّ does (R). The  
verbal *ns.* have the same government as the *vs.* that  
they act as substitutes for : so that, if that *v.* govern  
the *nom.* only, the verbal *n.* does so too, as ضَعَّ i. q.  
بَعْدَ زَيْدٍ هَيْهَاتَ زَيْدٍ i. q. اِكْفَفَ , and اِسْكَنَ i. q. اِسْكَنَ ,  
a latent [165] *pron.* being in ضَعَّ and اِسْكَنَ , as in اِسْكَنَ  
and اِكْفَفَ , and زَيْدٍ being governed in the *nom.* by  
هَيْهَاتَ [20], as by بَعْدَ ; and, if that *v.* govern the *nom.*  
and *acc.*, the verbal *n.* does so too. as دَرَاكَ زَيْدًا i. q.  
اِضْرِبْهُ , اِضْرِبْهُ i. q. ضَرَابَ عَمْرًا and اِدْرِكْهُ  
دَرَاكَ and ضَرَابَ , and زَيْدًا and عَمْرًا being governed in  
the *acc.* by them [44] (IA). The پ is often *red.* in

their *obj.*, as <sup>عَلَيْكَ</sup> <sup>بِـ</sup>, because, being weak in government, they are supported by a *p.* accustomed to conduct the *intrans.* to the *obj.* [433, 503]. According to the BB, they are not preceded by their *accs.*, from regard to the *o. f.*, because they are mostly *inf. ns.*, which may not be preceded by their *regs.* [342]; or *ejs.* aplastic in themselves, transferred to the *cat.* of *inf. ns.* and thence to that of the verbal *n.*; or *advs.* or *preps.* and *gens.*, which also are weak before the transfer, since their government is [merely] because of their implying the sense of the *v.*: but the KK allow that, citing as evidence <sup>يَا أَيُّهَا الْعَائِضُ الْخ</sup> [my bucket take thou (Jsh)]; whereas, according to the BB, <sup>دُونِكَ</sup> here is not a verbal *n.*, but an *adv.*, *enunc.* of <sup>دُونِي</sup> [1], i. e. *my bucket is before thee: (then take it)* (R). The verbal *n.*, like the *v.*, is not *pre.*: and therefore they say that <sup>بَلَّ</sup> and <sup>رَوَيْ</sup> in <sup>بَلَّ زَيْدٌ</sup> [192] and <sup>رَوَيْ زَيْدٌ</sup> [188] are *inf. ns.*, the Fatha being a Fatha of inflection; and in <sup>بَلَّ زَيْدًا</sup> and <sup>رَوَيْ زَيْدًا</sup> verbal *ns.*, the Fatha being then known to be a Fatha of uninflectedness, because of the absence of Tanwīn. The *aor.* is not governed in the *subj.* in the *correl.* of the requisitive verbal *n.*: you do not say <sup>صَدَّ فَأَحْدَثَكَ</sup> with the *subj.*, contrary to the opinion of Ks [411]; but the *aor.* is governed in the *apoc.* in its *correl.*, as <sup>مَكَانَكَ</sup> <sup>الْخ</sup> [420, 421] (Sh). Most of the verbal *ns.* are i. q.

the *imp.*, since in command one often contents oneself with making a sign instead of articulating its expression, and much more therefore may one content oneself with an expression acting as a substitute for it; whereas enunciation is not like that: and the meanings of the verbal *ns.*, whether *imp.* or otherwise, are more intensive and *corrob.* than those of the *vs.* that they are said to be in the sense of; while all that are enunciatory contain the sense of *wonder*, so that هَيْهَاتْ means *How far!*, شَتَّانْ *How different!*, سُرْعَانْ and وَشْكَانْ *How quick!*, and بَطَّانْ *How slow!*, the *wonder* being the *corroboration* mentioned. All of them are without any sign for the [attached] *pron.* governed by them in the *nom.* [161, 163, 165], the prominence of which in any of them proves it to be a *v.*, and not one of them, like هَلَمْ [189] and هَاتْ [below]. The affixion of the ك of allocution [163, 560] and of the Tanwīn [198, 608] is not regular in all these *ns.*, but is restricted to hearsay. When the ك is attached to these *ns.*, then, (1) if it be attached to what is *orig.* an *adv.* or *prep.*, it is a *n.* governed in the *gen.* from regard to its *o.f.*, as in إِلَيْكَ and أَمَامَكَ [199]; (2) if it be attached to what occurs both as a *pre. inf. n.* and as a verbal *n.*, as زَيْدٌ and زَيْدًا [188], it may be either a *n.* governed in the *gen.* from regard to the *n.*'s being an *inf. n. pre.* to its *ag.*, or a *p.* of allocution from regard to the *n.*'s being a verbal *n.*,

as in <sup>زَيْدٌ</sup> [161, 188, 560]; (3) if it may not be *post.*, it is a *p.* of allocution, as in <sup>هَآكُ</sup> [190], since <sup>زَيْدٌ</sup> <sup>هَآ</sup> does not occur (R). As R says (Sn), according to the majority (R), the Tanwīn affixed to some of these *ns.* denotes *indeterminateness* [608], not of the *v.* signified by that *n.* pronounced with Tanwīn, since the *v.* is neither *det.* nor *indet.*, but of the *inf. n.* signified by that *n.* before it became a verbal *n.*, [because the verbal *n.* pronounced with Tanwīn is either an *inf. n.* or an *ej.* firstly substituted for the *inf. n.* and secondly transferred to the *cat.* of the verbal *n.*, so that <sup>صَمٌ</sup> means <sup>سَكُوتًا مَّا</sup> : and therefore the verbal *n.* divested of Tanwīn, out of those that Tanwīn is affixed to, is like the *det.* (R),] so that <sup>صَمٌ</sup> means <sup>أَسْكُتِ السَّكُوتَ الْمَعْرُوفَ الْمَعْيَنَ</sup> *Be silent with the known, specified silence* ; [and, specification of the *inf. n.* being by specification of its *reg.*, i. e. *the story that silence is kept from*, this means <sup>أَفْعَلِ السَّكُوتَ</sup> *Keep silence from this specified story* (R)] ; and accordingly it is allowable for the person addressed not to keep silence from something else than the story indicated ; [and similarly <sup>مِمَّا</sup> means *Abstain from this thing*, and <sup>أَيْدِ</sup> means *Tell the known story*, the determination in the *inf. n.* being reducible to determination of its *reg.* (R) :] and [the indeterminateness is

similar, so that (R)] صَ means <sup>اَسْكُتْ سَكُوتًا</sup>, i e. *Keep unrestricted silence*, [applicable to every silence supposable (R),] from whatever story it be (R, Sn), since there is no specification in it (Su): and, according to them, omission of the Tanwīn is not evidence of determination in all the verbal *ns.* [198], but only in such as the Tanwīn of indeterminateness is affixed to (R). From this it follows that the verbal *ns.* in the state of determination belong to the class of *n.* made *det.* by the <sup>أَلْ</sup> denoting *knowledge* [599], which is plainer than the saying of some that they then belong to the class of *n.* made *det.* by the <sup>أَلْ</sup> denoting *genus*, and than the saying of others that they then belong to the class of generic proper name [198] (Sn). But, according to ISk and Jb, its affixion to such of them as it is affixed to is evidence of their being continuous with what follows them, and its suppression is evidence of pause upon them: you say <sup>صَ صَ</sup> and <sup>مَ مَ</sup> with Tanwīn in the 1st and quiescence of the *ṣ* in the 2nd; and the saying of Dhu-r Rumma

وَقَفْنَا فَقُلْنَا أَيُّهُ عَنْ أُمِّ سَالِمٍ \* وَمَا بَالُ تَكْلِيمِ الدِّيَارِ الْبَلَّاعِ

[198] *We stopped, and said, Tell us more about Umm Sālim! And what is the good of speaking to the empty dwellings?* occurs, say they, without Tanwīn, though he does continue, because pause is meant to be understood: so that, according to them, the Tanwīn is *orig*



the Tanwīn of declinability indicating that what it is affixed to is continuous with what follows it, not paused upon [609, 640], being divested of the meaning of declinability in these *ns.*, and put to indicate the meaning mentioned (R). The verbal *ns.* are of two kinds, (1) *imp.*, which has the prevalence, (a) *trans.*, as (a) <sup>زَيْدًا</sup> *زَيْدًا* Deal gently with Zaid, and Give him time [188], i. e. <sup>أَرْدَدَ</sup> *أَرْدَدَ* and <sup>أَمَهَّلَ</sup> *أَمَهَّلَ*, [orig. the *inf. n* <sup>أَرْدَا</sup> *أَرْدَا*, and made a curt *dim.* by elision of the *augs.* (291) ; or, as Fr says, *dim.* of <sup>رَوٍ</sup> *رَوٍ* gentleness (IY)] : (b) <sup>زَيْدًا</sup> *زَيْدًا* i. q. <sup>رَوِيٌّ</sup> *رَوِيٌّ*, [and <sup>زَيْدًا</sup> *زَيْدًا* transmitted by the Bdd, most probably derived from <sup>تَوَدَّدَ</sup> *تَوَدَّدَ* slowness, the *ف* being a *و* permanently changed into *ت*, as in <sup>تَوَدَّدَ</sup> *تَوَدَّدَ* (689), and the *ع* being a Hamza irregularly changed into *ي* for a kind of alleviation, as in <sup>قَرَاتٍ</sup> *قَرَاتٍ* for <sup>قَرِيَّتٍ</sup> *قَرِيَّتٍ* (685) (IY)] : (c) <sup>زَيْدًا</sup> *زَيْدًا* Bring Zaid near, and Present him, i. e. <sup>قَرَبَ</sup> *قَرَبَ* and <sup>أَحْضَرَ</sup> *أَحْضَرَ* [189] : (d) <sup>هَاتِ الشَّيْءَ</sup> *هَاتِ الشَّيْءَ* Give me the thing [428], i. e. <sup>أَعْطَيْتُهُ</sup> *أَعْطَيْتُهُ*, [which has the *pron.* of the *du.* and *pl.* affixed to it, because of its strong resemblance to the *v.* (IY),] whence II. 105. [and in tradition <sup>هَاتُوا رُبْعَ عَشْرٍ</sup> *هَاتُوا رُبْعَ عَشْرٍ* Give ye the fourth of the tenths of your goods, like <sup>هَاتِ</sup> *هَاتِ* (189) and <sup>هَاتِ</sup> *هَاتِ* (190) (IY)] : (e) <sup>هَاتِ زَيْدًا</sup> *هَاتِ زَيْدًا* Take Zaid, i. e. <sup>خَذَ</sup> *خَذَ* [190] : (f) <sup>حَبَّهْلَ التَّيْرِيذِ</sup> *حَبَّهْلَ التَّيْرِيذِ*, i. e. <sup>أَيْتَهُ</sup> *أَيْتَهُ* [191] :

(g) <sup>بَلِّغْ</sup> <sup>زَيْدًا</sup> *Let alone Zaid*, i. e. <sup>دَعُ</sup> [192]: (h) <sup>تَرَاكُهَا</sup> *Leave them*, i. e. <sup>أَتْرَكُهَا</sup> [193]: (i) <sup>زَيْدًا</sup> <sup>عَلَيْكَ</sup> *Keep to Zaid*, i. e. <sup>الزَّيْمَةُ</sup>; and <sup>زَيْدًا</sup> <sup>عَلَى</sup> *Present Zaid to me and Bring him near to me* [199], i. e. <sup>أَوْلَانِيَّةً</sup> [and <sup>قَرَبَةً</sup> <sup>مِنْنِي</sup> (AAz)]: (b) *intrans*, as (a) <sup>صَمَّ</sup> *Hush*, i. e. <sup>أَسْكُتْ</sup>: (b) <sup>مُمْ</sup> *Hold*, i. e. <sup>أَكْفِفْ</sup>: (c) <sup>أَيَّةً</sup> *Tell, or Add more*, i. e. <sup>حَدَّثَ</sup> [or <sup>زَنَ</sup>, which is mentioned with the *intrans.* from regard to usage, since they hardly ever say <sup>أَيَّةً</sup> <sup>أَلَكَدِيثِ</sup>, though analogy does not forbid it, but rather requires it, because <sup>أَيَّةً</sup> acts as a substitute for a *trans.* v. <sup>حَدَّثَ</sup> or <sup>زَنَ</sup> (IY)]: (d) <sup>هَيِّتْ</sup> *Make haste*, i. e. <sup>أَسْرِعْ</sup>, [which is said in calling, as says the poet

أَبْلِغْ أَمِيرَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ أَخَا الْعِرَاقِ إِذَا أَتَيْتَا  
أَنْ الْعِرَاقِ وَاهْلَكَ \* سَلِّمِ الْبَيْتَ فَهَيِّتْ هَيِّتَا

*Convey thou to the Commander of the Believers, brother of Al-'Irāk, when thou comest, that Al-'Irāk and its people are devoted to thee, then make haste, make haste*, meaning 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib; and has three *dial. vars.* <sup>هَيِّتْ</sup> (IY)]: (e) [ <sup>هَلْ</sup> or (AAz) ] <sup>هَلْ</sup> [or <sup>هَلْ</sup> (191) (IY)] *Make haste and Come*, i. e. <sup>أَسْرِعْ</sup> [and <sup>تَعَالَّ</sup>, orig. a chiding for the horse (191, 200), and afterwards made a verbal n.

(IY)]: (f) هَيِّكْ *Make haste in what thou art about*, [the *n.* being هَيَّ, and the ك a *p.* of allocution (IY),] and هَيِّكْ [lightened by elision of one ي (IY)], and هَيَّا, [the ا being put for pause when the ك is not affixed (IY),] i. e. اسْرِعْ فِيمَا أَنْتَ فِيهِ, as

لِنَقْرِبَنَّ قَرَبًا جَانِبًا \* مَا دَامَ فِيهِمْ فَصِيلٌ حَيًّا  
فَقَدْ دَجَا اللَّيْلُ فَهَيَّا هَيَّا

[by Ibn Mayyāda (IY, AAz), addressing his she-camel (IY), *Assuredly thou shalt make a rapid journey by night to the watering-place of the morning, so long as a young weaned camel continues to be among them. (If thou resolve upon journeying, the ف being the correl. of the prop.,) the night has grown dark: then make haste, make haste (AAz)]: (g) نَزَالٍ Alight, i. e. أَنْزَلٍ [193]: (h) أَكْتَفْ and تَطُكْ and قَدْكَ and أَتَتْكَ, [the ك being a *p.* of allocution, and قَدْ and قَطْ contracted from قَدْ and قَطْ, because they are derived from قَدَدْتُ الشَّيْءَ and قَطَّطْتُ I cut the thing along and across, as though being satisfied were a cutting off from everything else (IY)]: (i) ائِيكَ Be off, i. e. تَنَحَّ, [as in the verse {of 'Abīd Ibn Al'Abraṣ (SR)} cited by Th.*

اَذْهَبْ اِلَيْكَ فَاَنْتَ مِنْ بَنِي اَسَدٍ  
اَهْلِ الْقُبَابِ وَاَهْلِ الْخَيْلِ وَالنَّادِي

*Go, be off, for verily I am of the Banu Asad, the people of the tents made of skins, and the people of the horses and the assembly, as though the poet said اَذْهَبْ تَنْعَ (IY)]; and اَلَى I will be off, heard by Akh from a man when اَلَيْكَ was said to him, as though تَنْع had been said to him, and he said اَتَنْحَى [199]: (j) دَع Recover thyself, i. e. اِنْعَشِ, [said to the stumbler or to him that is afflicted by a calamity, as*

لَعَنَى اللّٰهُ قَرَمًا لَمْ يَغْرُلُوا لِعَاثِرٍ  
وَلَا لِابْنِ عَمٍّ نَالَكَ الدَّهْرُ دُعْدَعًا

*God shame a people that say not to a stumbler, nor to a son of a paternal uncle that fortune has afflicted, "Recover thyself!" (IY)]; and دُعْدَعًا or دُعَا لَكَ, [which is, however, an infl inf. n., like سَقِيًا لَكَ (IY), because it is explained by the p.]: (k) اَمِيْنُ and اَمِيْنُ Answer Thou, [said in prayer (IY),] i. q. اِسْتَجِبْ (2) enun- ciatory, [which is rare (IY),] as (a) هَيْهَاتَ ذَاكَ Very, or Wholly, far is that! [195], i. e. [جَدًا (IY)] بَعْدُ [or كَلَّ البَعْدُ, which requires an ag., like the v., as هَيْهَاتَ*

هَيْهَاتَ الْعَقِيقُ الْخ (above): while in XXIII. 38. (564) some say that the ل is *red.*, and مَا the *ag.*, i. e. هَيْهَاتَ هَيْهَاتَ *Far, far off, is what etc*; some that the *ag.* is suppressed, i. e. بَعْدَ الصَّدْقِ لِمَا الْخ *Far, far off is (the fulfilment) of what etc.*; and some that the *ag.* is a *pron.* in هَيْهَاتَ, i. e. هَيْهَاتَ بَعْنَكُمْ *Far, far off is your resurrection* or اخراجكم *your being brought forth*, because the اخراج is previously mentioned (IY): (b) زَيْدٌ وَعَمْرُو [196], i. e. اَفْدَرَقَا and نَبَاتَا, [the ن of which is sometimes pronounced with Kasr (IY)]: (c) سَرَعَانِ ذَا اَهَالَةً, i. e. سَرَعٌ, [a *proc.*, meaning *How quick is this as melted fat!*, اَهَالَةً being in the *acc.* as a *sp.* (IY)]: (d) وَشَانِ ذَا [and قَرَبٌ, *How quick, and soon, is this in coming forth*, خُرُوجًا being in the *acc.* as a *sp.* (IY)]: (e) اَفٌ I am disgusted, i. q. اَنْضَجِر [197]: (f) اَوْهٌ I am pained, i. q. اَتَوْجَع (M), which has several *dial. vars.*, اَوْهٌ مِنْ كَذَا, as

فَاَوْهٌ اَنْذَكْرَاهَا اِذَا مَا ذَكَرْتَهَا \* وَمِنْ بَعْدِ اَرْضٍ بَيْنَنَا وَسَمَاوِ  
[Then alas for the remembrance of her, whenever I remember her, and for the distance of earth between us and sky! (N)], اَوْهٌ, اَوْهٌ, and اَوْهٌ (IY). The chastest

is <sup>ق</sup>اَوْ with Kasr, Damm, or Fath of the <sup>ا</sup>ا, Kasr being the most prevalent, as <sup>ق</sup>اَوْ <sup>ل</sup>لِ <sup>ك</sup>كَرَاهَا <sup>ا</sup>الْخ (D). <sup>ق</sup>قَد is (1) a *n. syn.* with <sup>ح</sup>حَسِبَ, (a) mostly *uninfl.*, because of its resemblance to the *p.* <sup>ق</sup>قَد [575] in its letter, and to many *ps.* in its [*bil.* (DM)] constitution, as <sup>ق</sup>قَد <sup>ز</sup>زَيْدٍ <sup>د</sup>دِرْهَمٍ Zaid's sufficiency is a dirham and <sup>ق</sup>قَدْنِي My sufficiency; (b) seldom *infl.*, as <sup>ق</sup>قَد <sup>ز</sup>زَيْدٍ <sup>د</sup>دِرْهَمٍ with [<sup>ق</sup>قَد in (DM)] the *nom.*, like <sup>ق</sup>قَد <sup>ز</sup>زَيْدٍ <sup>د</sup>دِرْهَمٍ, and <sup>ق</sup>قَدِي, like <sup>ح</sup>حَسْبِي : (2) a verbal *n*, [always *uninfl.* (DM),] *syn.* with <sup>ي</sup>يَكْفِي, as <sup>ق</sup>قَد <sup>ز</sup>زَيْدًا <sup>د</sup>دِرْهَمٍ A dirham suffices Zaid and <sup>ق</sup>قَدْنِي suffices me, like <sup>ق</sup>قَد <sup>ز</sup>زَيْدًا <sup>د</sup>دِرْهَمٍ and <sup>ي</sup>يَكْفِينِي [170]. <sup>ق</sup>قَطَا is (1) [a *n.* (DM)] *syn.* with <sup>ح</sup>حَسِبَ, as <sup>ق</sup>قَطَا <sup>د</sup>دِرْهَمٍ My sufficiency is a dirham and <sup>ق</sup>قَطَاكَ Thy sufficiency and <sup>ق</sup>قَطَا <sup>ز</sup>زَيْدٍ Zaid's sufficiency, like <sup>ح</sup>حَسْبِي <sup>د</sup>دِرْهَمٍ and <sup>ح</sup>حَسْبِكَ and <sup>ح</sup>حَسْبٍ <sup>ز</sup>زَيْدٍ, except that it is *uninfl.*, because it is constituted of two letters, whereas <sup>ح</sup>حَسِبَ is *infl.*: (2) a verbal *n. syn.* with <sup>ي</sup>يَكْفِي, as <sup>ق</sup>قَطَانِي Suffices me, like <sup>ي</sup>يَكْفِينِي; and the <sup>ق</sup>ق of protection is allowable in the 1st case also, [where it is *syn.* with <sup>ح</sup>حَسِبَ (DM),] for preservation of the uninflectedness upon quiescence. <sup>ب</sup>بَجَلْ is (1) a

verbal *n. syn* with يَكْفِي, as بُجِّلْنِي Suffices me, [like يَكْفِينِي (DM).] which [usage (DM)] is rare: (2) a *n. syn.* with حَسِب, as بُجِّلِي My sufficiency, whence

أَلَا إِنِّي شَرِبْتُ اسْوَنَ حَالِكًا  
أَلَا بُجِّلِي مِنْ ذَا الشَّرَابِ أَلَا بُجِّلْ

[by Tarafa, *Now, verily I have drunk a dark, black (poison): now, I have had enough of this draught, now, enough!* (Jsh); and in this case expression of the ن is rare (170) (DM)]. وَأُ is a [verbal (DM)] *n. i. q.* أعجِب, as

وَأُبَابِي أَنْتِ وَفُوكِ الْأَشَدُّ \* كَانَمَا ذَرَّ عَلَيْهِ الزَّرْنَبُ  
أَوْ زَنْجَبِيلٌ وَهُوَ عِنْدِي أَطْيَبُ

[by a Rājiz of Taim (FA), *I marvel at thy beauty (with my father be thou ransomed!); and thy cool sweet mouth is as though saffron had been sprinkled upon it, or ginger, which to my mind is nicer* (FA), (DM)]: and sometimes وَهَّا [198] is said, as

وَاهَّا اسْلَمَى ثُمَّ وَاهَّا وَاَهَا \* هِيَ الْأَمْنَى لَوْ أَنَا نَلَمْنَاهَا

[by Abu-nNajm al'Ijlī, *I marvel at the niceness of Salma, again I marvel, I marvel! She is (the object of) desires—would that we had got them!* (Jsh)]; and وَى [200], as

وَيَ كَانَ مِنْ يَكُنِي لَهُ نَشَبٌ يَحْسَبُ — بَدَبٌ وَمِنْ يَفْتَقِرُ يَعْشَى عَيْشِي ضَرِ

[by Sa'īd Ibn Zaid asṢahābī, *I wonder! Verily he that has wealth is beloved, and he that is needy lives a life of hardship* (Jsh)]. And sometimes the ك of allocution is affixed to this [وَيَ i. q. اَعْجَبَ (DM)], as

وَلَقَدْ شَفَى نَفْسِي وَأَبْرَأَ سَقَمَهَا \* قِيلَ الْفَوَارِسِ وَيَكُ عَنْتَرُ أَقْدِمِ

[by 'Antara, *And assuredly the saying of the horsemen "I wonder {at thee (Jsh)}, 'Antara, advance!" did heal my mind, and cure its distemper* (FA, Jsh)]; but Ks says that وَيَكُ is orig. وَيَلِكُ, in which case the ك is a pron. governed in the gen. [by prothesis (FA)]: and, as for

وَيَ XXVIII. 82. [200], Akh says that وَيَ is a verbal-n., the ك a p. of allocution [affixed to وَيَ,

as in وَيَكُ عَنْتَرُ الْخُ (K)], and اَنْ [in the position of a gen.] by subaudition of the ل, the sense being *I marvel because God*; but Khl says that وَيَ is separate [from

وَيَ (K)], as in وَيَ كَانَ مِنْ الْخُ [above], in which case وَيَ denotes *verification* [531], as in

كَانَتْنِي حَبِيْ اَمْسِي لَا تَكَلِّمْنِي \* مَتِيْمٌ يَشْتَهِيْ مَا لَيْسَ مَوْجُودًا

[by Sulaimān Ibn 'Abd AlMalik, or, as is said (Jsh), by 'Umar Ibn Abī Rabī'a (KA, Jsh) alMakhzūmī, *Verily I, when I enter upon the evening while she speaks not to me,*



*am a thrall that longs for what is not to be found* (Jsh)],  
 i e. <sup>اننى</sup> [the sense being *I marvel! Verily God*]  
 (ML).

§ 188. <sup>روى</sup> is (1) [*uninfl.* (M),] a verbal *n.* (M, R), transferred from the *inf. n.* [187], through frequency of usage, by the *v.*'s not being supplied before it, but the *inf. n.*'s being made to act as a substitute for the *v.*, and pronounced with Fath only because it is *uninfl.* upon the vowel appropriate in inflection [199] (R), *trans.* to a [single (IY) direct (R)] *obj.*, as <sup>روى زيدا</sup> (IY, R): the poet [Mālik Ibn Khālīd alKhunā'i (DH)] says

<sup>روى علما جد ما ثدى امهم \* الينا ولكن بغضهم متمائين</sup>

[*Let 'Alī alone for a while: their relationship to us has been cut off, but their hatred is old, remote* (DH)],

'Alī being a tribe [of Kināna (ISk), <sup>ما</sup> red. (DH)], and

<sup>ثدى</sup> a *met.* for <sup>قراية</sup> (IY); and [sometimes <sup>ما</sup> is redun-

dantly added to <sup>روى</sup> when a verbal *n.*, as (R)] an Arab

said [to his fellow (R)] <sup>والله لو اردت الدراهم لاعطيتك</sup>

<sup>روى ما الشعر</sup> (M, R), i. e. *By God, if thou hadst desired*

*dirhams, I would have given to thee: [then (IY)] let*

*poetry alone, [thou hast no need of it (IY)]; and [some-*

*times the ك of allocution is affixed to it, so that (IY)]*

<sup>روى زيدا</sup> [161, 187, 560] is said (IY, R), where it may be



a d. s. (R): the poet says رُوَيْدًا بَنَى شَيْبَانَ أَخ [156], which is also related رُوَيْد (IY), *Leave off, Banū Shaibān, some of your threatening*, وَعَيْدُكُمْ being the obj. of [the inf. n. رُوَيْدًا or verbal n رُوَيْد (FA, Jsh): the Hudhali says رُوَيْدٌ عَلَيَّ جَدِّ أَخ [above] (ISk): and the prov. says رُوَيْدُكَ الشَّعْرُ يَغْبُ [Leave the poetry alone. It will remain a night, [like زَيْدًا زَيْدًا] (T).

§ 189. هَلَمْ is compounded, (1) according to our school, from the premonitory p. [هَ (IY)] together with هَلَمْ, [its o. f., says Khl, being هَ هَلَمْ, from the saying اللَّهُ شَعْتُهُ لَمْ God unite his disunion!, i. e. جُمَعَهُ, as though the speaker meant لَمْ نَفْسُكَ الْيُنَا Unite (thyself to us), i. e. اقْرُبْ Draw near; and (IY)] the هَ being elided from هَ [for alleviation, because of frequency of usage, and because the ل after it, though mobile, is in the predicament of the quiescent, since the o. f. and the stronger of the two dial. vars., vid. the Hījāzī, is هَلَمْ (731), so that the هَ of هَ is elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents (IY)]: (2) according to the KK, from هَلْ together with هَلَمْ, [its o. f., says Fr, being هَلْ هَلَمْ, i. e. اقْصِدْ and (IY)] the Hamza being [alleviated

by having its vowel thrown upon the ن, and being (IY)] elided, [so that the word becomes هَلَمَّ ; and the هَلَّ compounded with اَم being the one denotative not of *interrogation*, but of *chiding* and *urging*, from the saying

لَمْ يَسْمَعْ قَوْلِي حَتَّى هَلَّ

(191) (IY)]. The Hijāzīs make it uniform in all numbers and genders, [like مَ، صَ، etc. ; which form is in accordance with analogy (187), and occurs in the Revelation, as وَالْمُتَكَلِّمِينَ لِأَخْوَانِهِمْ هَلُمَّ إِلَيْنَا XXXIII. 18. *And the sayers to their brethren, Come hither to us* (IY)]: but the Banū Tamīm, [having regard to the v. اَم, and giving predominance to its side (IY),] say هَلَمُوا، هَلَمِي، and [according to the BB and most of the KK (IY)] هَلَمْنِي، [because the ل of the word becomes quiescent upon attachment of this ن to it, as ضَرَبْنِي and, when the letter before the ن becomes quiescent, the incorporation is annulled, and the word becomes like اَرَدْنِي (731) ; while Fr asserts that هَلَمْنِي ought to be said, because, this ن being always preceded by a quiescent, they add a 2nd ن before it for the quiescence to fall upon, in order that the Fatha of the م in هَلَمَّ may be preserved, as they say مَنِّي and عَنِّي, adding a

2nd ن in order that the ن of <sup>هَلَم</sup> and <sup>هَلَم</sup> may be preserved from Kasr (170); and <sup>هَلَمِين</sup> also has been transmitted from some of the Arabs, the letter added for protection being made a ي, which is anomalous (IY). It is *trans.*, [as <sup>هَلَم</sup> زَيْدًا, i. q. <sup>قَرَبَة</sup> and <sup>أَحْضَرَة</sup> (IY).] like <sup>هَات</sup>; and *intrans.*, [as <sup>هَلَم</sup> يَا زَيْد (IY),] i. q. <sup>تُعَال</sup> and <sup>أَقْبَل</sup>: e. g. <sup>هَلَم</sup> شَهِدَا وَكَمْ VI. 151. *Bring forward your witnesses* and XXXIII. 18. (M). And sometimes <sup>هَلَم</sup> لَكَ is said, <sup>هَلَم</sup> being explained by the ل, because, though not *orig.* an *inf. n.*, it is treated like the verbal *ns.* that are explained by the *prep.* from regard to their *o. f.* when they were *inf. ns.*, as XXIII. 38. [187, 504], i. e. <sup>بَعْدَا</sup> (R). And As relates that, when <sup>هَلَم</sup> [or <sup>هَلَم</sup> كُنَا (IY, R)] is said to a man, he says <sup>لَا أَهْلَم</sup> (IY, R) or <sup>لَا أَهْلَمَة</sup>, *orig.* <sup>لَا أَهْلَم</sup> (IY, R), like <sup>لَا أَرَب</sup> (IY), the  $\delta$  pronounced with Fath being *aug.* (R), as though he restored it to its *o. f.* before the composition (IY); or <sup>لَا أَرْوَم</sup> according to the other opinion, the  $\delta$  and ل not being altered in the reply from regard to the form of the address (R): but this is anomalous (IY).

§ 190. <sup>هـ</sup> is i. q. <sup>خُذْ</sup> (M, R), <sup>تَنَازَلْ</sup>, and the like (IY). It has 8 *dial. vars.*:—(1) you say <sup>هـ</sup> with a single quiescent <sup>هـ</sup> for the *sing.*, *du.* and *pl.*, *masc.* or *fem.* (R): (2) you affix [to this single <sup>هـ</sup> (R)] the [*p.* (IY, R)] <sup>ك</sup> [of allocation (IY, R)]; and vary it [according to the states of the person addressed (M) in gender and number (IY)], as <sup>هَآك</sup>, [<sup>هَآك</sup>, <sup>هَآكُمَا</sup>, <sup>هَآكُم</sup>, and <sup>هَآكُنَّ</sup> (IY, R)]: (3) you affix [to the <sup>هـ</sup> (IY, R)] a Hamza in place of the <sup>ك</sup>; and vary it like the <sup>ك</sup>, as <sup>هَآه</sup> (M, R), <sup>هَآؤُمَا</sup>, <sup>هَآؤُم</sup>, [<sup>هَآؤُنَّ</sup>, [whence LXIX. 19. (22) (IY).] and <sup>هَآؤُنَّ</sup> (IY, R): this is the best *dial. var.* (IY, B on LXIX. 19.), and is the one that occurs in the Scripture; but <sup>هَآؤُم</sup> is strange, because the <sup>م</sup> is found in the *pron.* of the 2nd *pers.* only when it is not in the *imp*, as <sup>هَآؤُمَا</sup> and <sup>هَآؤُنَّ</sup> (IY): (4) you combine the Hamza and the <sup>ك</sup>, [as <sup>هَآك</sup> (M), to corroborate the allocation (IY),] pronouncing the Hamza with Fath, and varying the <sup>ك</sup> (M, R): (5) you say <sup>هـ</sup> with a quiescent Hamza after the <sup>هـ</sup> for all [numbers and genders]: (6) you conjugate this 5th like <sup>هَآه</sup> (R); [for] some say <sup>هـ</sup> upon the measure of <sup>هَآه</sup>, and conjugate it like the latter (M), as <sup>هَآه</sup>, <sup>هَآي</sup>, <sup>هَآؤَا</sup>, and <sup>هَآؤُنَّ</sup> (IY): (7) you conjugate it like <sup>هَآه</sup> (IY, R), as <sup>هَآه</sup>, <sup>هَآي</sup>, <sup>هَآؤَا</sup>, and <sup>هَآؤُنَّ</sup> (IY):

or هَائِي, هَاوَا, and هَانِ, making it a *v.* [below], which is corroborated by the saying مِمَّنْ اِهَاءُ *From whom shall I take?* transmitted by Ks as said in reply to هَاءُ, like مِمَّنْ اخَافُ; and, according to this opinion, it is on the measure of يَفْعَلُ فَعْلٌ, like اَخَالَ خَلْتُ, for which reason the Hamza of its initial may be pronounced with Kasr [404] (IY): (8) you [affix a Hamza to the ا, and (R)] conjugate it like (M, R) نَادَ (R) [or] دَامَ (M), as هَائِي, هَائِيَا, هَاوَا, and هَانِي; and the saying of 'Alī

اِفَاتِمُ هَاءُ السِّيفِ غَيْرُ مَذْمُومٍ \* فَلَسْتُ بِرَعْدِي وَلَا بِلَتِيمِ

[O Fātima, take the sword not blamed; for I am not dastardly, nor base (DA)] may be of the 3rd *dial.* or of this, the ي being elided in the latter case because of the quiescence of the ج after it (IY). The last three are *aplastic vs.* [above], having neither *pret.* nor *aor.*, not *verbal ns.* [187] (R).

§ 191. حَيْهَلٌ is compounded of حَى and هَلْ or (AAz) هَلْ, [two *ejs.* meaning *urging* and *hastening* (IY)]. It is *uninfl.* upon Fath, [as حَيْهَلٌ, whence اِنَا نَكْرِ اَصَالُ الْكُونِ فَكَيْهَلُ بَعْدَ حَيْهَلًا (below) (IY)]; and

with Tanwīn [198] is said, [whence <sup>بَحِيلًا</sup> <sup>يَزْجُونَ</sup> <sup>الْخ</sup> (below), according to the usual version (AAz)]; and <sup>بَحِيلًا</sup> with the ʾ: S mentions these *dial. vars.*; and others add <sup>بَحِيلًا</sup>, [whence <sup>يَتَمَارَى</sup> <sup>الْخ</sup> (below) (IY),] and <sup>بَحِيلًا</sup>, and <sup>بَحِيلًا</sup> (M). When you pause upon <sup>بَحِيلًا</sup> and <sup>بَحِيلًا</sup>, you convert their ن into ʾ [615]; but in continuity expression of the ʾ in them is a vicious *dial.*: and Labīd in his saying

يَتَمَارَى فِي الَّذِي قُلْتُ لَهُ \* وَلَقَدْ يَسْمَعُ قَوْلِي حَيْهَلْ

[mentioning a fellow-traveller whom he was bidding to start, *He doubts about what I have said to him; and assuredly he does hear my saying "Come along" (MAR),*] makes the ل quiescent for the sake of the rhyme; but this is not allowable except in pause: and the KSh gives <sup>بَحِيلًا</sup> [187] with [Fath of the ʾ and (AAz)] Kasr and Tanwīn of the ل (R). It is (1) [i. q. <sup>أَيْت</sup>, and therefore (R)] *trans.* by itself, [as <sup>بَحِيلًا</sup> <sup>الْتَرِيدُ</sup> *Come to the crumbled bread moistened with broth* (R)]: (2) [i. q. <sup>أَسْرَعَ</sup>, and therefore (R)] *trans.* by (a) the ب, as [in the speech of ‘Abd Allāh Ibn Mas‘ud (AAz) in tradition (M)] <sup>أَنَا</sup> <sup>ذَكَرَ</sup> <sup>الْأَصَالِحُونَ</sup> <sup>فَحَيْهَلًا</sup> <sup>بَعْمَر</sup> [When the righteous are men-



tioned, hasten (the mention of) 'Umar, i. e. <sup>أَسْرِعْ</sup> <sup>بِنَكْرَةٍ</sup>,  
 the ب denoting *making trans.* (R)]; (b) <sup>أَلَى</sup>, [as <sup>حَيْهَلْ</sup>,  
<sup>أَلَى</sup> <sup>الثَّرِيدِ</sup> *Haste to the etc.* (R)]: (3) [i. q. <sup>أَقْبَلْ</sup>, and  
 therefore (R)] *trans.* by <sup>عَلَى</sup> (M, R), as <sup>حَيْهَلْ</sup> <sup>عَلَى</sup> <sup>زَيْدٍ</sup>  
*Approach Zaid*. According to F, the two members of  
 the *comp.*, as regards assumption of the *pron.*, are in the  
 same state as <sup>حَالُو</sup> <sup>حَامِضٍ</sup> [31], i. e. each of them contains  
 a *pron.*, as before the composition, while the aggregate  
 after the composition contains a 3rd *pron.*, which is *ag.*  
 of the aggregate, because the aggregate is i. q. <sup>أَيْتْ</sup>,  
<sup>أَسْرِعْ</sup>, or <sup>أَقْبَلْ</sup>; but, according to others, they contain a  
 single *pron.*, and not each of them a *pron.*, because the  
 predicament of independence is obliterated from each of  
 them by the composition: and, as for the saying

<sup>وَهَيْجَ</sup> <sup>الْحَى</sup> <sup>مِنْ</sup> <sup>دَارٍ</sup> <sup>فَضَلَ</sup> <sup>لَهُمْ</sup> \* <sup>يَوْمَ</sup> <sup>كَثِيرٍ</sup> <sup>تَمَائِدِهِ</sup> <sup>وَحَيْهَلْ</sup>

[mentioned by S as being by a man of the Banū Bakr  
 Ibn Wā'il, *And he* (the camel-driver in the preceding  
 verse) *roused the tribe from an abode; and a day, whose*  
*calling of one to another and "make haste" were many,*  
*was spent by them* (AAz)], the Damma of the ج is a  
 vowel of inflection, and the aggregate is a single term  
 without a *pron.*, because every expression other than a  
*prop.*, to whose form a predicament is attributed [194],

may be imitated, as ضَرَبَ فَعَلَ مَاضٍ *Daraba* is a preterite verb and

يُحْيِيهَا يَزْجُونَ كُلَّ مَطِيَّةٍ \* إِمَامَ الْمَطَايَا سِيرَهَا الْمُتَقَانُفُ

[by Muzāḥim al'Uḡailī, or, as is said (AAz), by An Nābigha alJa'dī, *With "Make haste" they drive on every riding-beast whose incessant journeying is before the riding-beasts* (IY, AAz)]; or may be declined with the cases of inflection [206], as

كَيْتَ شَعْرِي وَابْنِ مَنِي كَيْتَ \* إِنْ لَوْ أَنَّ لَيْتَ عَنَاءَ

[by Abū Zubaid (H),] *Would that I knew—and where on my part is "Would that"? Verily "If" and verily "Would that" are a weariness* [200] and تَنَادِيَةٌ وَحَيْهَلَةٌ [above]. And sometimes حَيْهَلُكَ [560] is said (R). حَى

and هَلْ are combined only for the sake of *intensiveness*; and, when you mean the original *call* without *intensiveness* (IY), حَى is used [alone (M)] in the sense of أَقْبَلُ, [made *trans.* by عَلَى (R),] as in [the saying of the Mu'adhdhin (M),] حَى عَلَى الصَّلَاةِ *Come to prayer* (M, R), which is only a *call* to prayer (IY): but, according to Akh, some of the Arabs say حَيْهَلُ الصَّلَاةِ *Come to prayer*; and حَى occurs *trans.* in the sense of أَيْتَ (R), whence

أَنْشَأْتُ إِسْأَلَ مَا بَالُ رَفَقَتِهِ  
حَى الْحَمُولِ فَإِنَّ الرُّكْبَ قَدْ ذَهَبَ

(IY, R), by Ibn Aḥmar (IY, MAR), *I commenced asking him what was the case of his fellow-travellers. "Come to the camels laden with litters: for verily the riders have gone"* (MAR): and [sometimes (IY)] هَلَّا [is used (AAz)] alone [in the sense of أَقْبَلَ and أَسْرَعَ (AAz)], as

أَلَا ابْلَغَا لَيْلَى وَقَوْلَا لَهَا هَلَّا \* لَقَدْ رَكِبْتَ امْرَأًا غَرًّا مَجْجَلًا  
(M), by AnNābigha alJa'dī (IY, AAz), satirizing Lailā al-Akhyaliya, *Now convey ye two (my message) to Lailā, and say to her, "Come up". (By God,) she has perpetrated a glaring, notorious matter, where هَلَّا contains a reproach and rebuke to her (AAz), i. e. أَقْبَلَى and أَقْبَلَى*; but the use of حَى alone is more frequent than that of هَلَّا alone (IY).

§ 192. بَلَّ is (1) a [verbal (M, R, DM)] *n.*, [i. q. نَع (IY, R, ML), i. e. أَتَرَكَ (DM), as بَلَّ زَيْدًا (IY, R), like نَع زَيْدًا (R)]: (2) an *inf. n.* (M, R, ML), i. q. التَّرَك (M, ML), *pre.* (M) to what follows it (IY), as بَلَّ زَيْدًا [with prefixion to the *obj.* (R)], like تَرَكَ زَيْدًا (M, R), of the *cat.* of XLVII. 4. [188] (IY); and AZ relates that it

is transposed, when it is an *inf. n.*, as <sup>هَلْ</sup> <sup>زَيْدٌ</sup> (M): (3) as transmitted by F from Akh (R), a *n.* (ML) i. q. <sup>كَيْفَ</sup> : (a) what follows it is governed in [the *acc.* according to the 1st, the *gen.* according to the 2nd, and (ML)] the *nom.* according to the 3rd (R, ML): (b) its Fatḥh is uninflectional according to the 1st and 3rd, and inflectional according to the 2nd (ML): (c) the saying [of Ka'b Ibn Mālik asṢaḥābī on the day of the Ditch (Jsh)]

تَذَرُ الْجَمَاجِمَ ضَاحِيًا هَامَاتَهَا \* بَلَاةً الْاَكْفَ كَانَهَا لَمْ تَخْلُقْ

[*They* (the *swords* mentioned in the preceding verse) *leave the skulls with their crowns laid bare, let alone the hands—or how then are the hands?—as though they had not been created* (Jsh)] is related with [ <sup>الْاَكْفَ</sup> in

(IY, R ] the *acc.* and *gen.* (M, R, ML) and *nom.* (R, ML) :

(d) when it is i. q. <sup>كَيْفَ</sup>, [says R (Dm),] <sup>مِنْ</sup> may be

prefixed to it [499] (R, Dm) : AZ transmits <sup>اِنْ</sup> <sup>فَلَانًا</sup> <sup>لَا</sup>

<sup>يُطِيقُ</sup> <sup>اِنْ</sup> <sup>يَحْمِلُ</sup> <sup>الْفِهْرَ</sup> <sup>فَمِنْ</sup> <sup>بَلَاةٍ</sup> <sup>اِنْ</sup> <sup>يَاْتِي</sup> <sup>بِالصَّخْرَةِ</sup> *Verily*

*such a one is not able to carry the stone : then how shall*

*he be able to bring the rock?*, i. e. <sup>كَيْفَ</sup> (IY, R, Dm)

and <sup>مِنْ</sup> <sup>اَيْنَ</sup> *whence?* (R, Dm); and another version is

<sup>مِنْ</sup> <sup>بِهَلْ</sup> by transposition (IY, R) : (e) a strange circum-

stance is that the SB in the exposition of the <sup>اَلْمِ</sup> of [the 32nd Chapter of the Ḳur named] <sup>السَّجْدَةُ</sup> contains [the

following words], “ God says, <sup>أَعَدَدْتُ لِعِبَادِي الصَّالِحِينَ</sup> مَا لَا عَيْنٌ رَأَتْ وَلَا أُذُنٌ سَمِعَتْ وَلَا خَطَرَ عَلَى قَلْبِ بَشَرٍ <sup>نُحْرًا مِنْ بَلَدٍ مَا أَطَّلَعْتُمْ عَلَيْهِ</sup> *I have made ready for My servants the righteous that which neither eye hath seen, nor ear heard, and which hath not occurred to the mind of man, as a treasure, other than, or not, what ye have become acquainted with*”, so that it is used *infl.*, governed in the *gen.* by <sup>مِنْ</sup>, and excluded from the three meanings [above mentioned] : but some expound it by <sup>غَيْرِ</sup>, which is plain ; and this corroborates those [vid. the KK and Bdd (DM)] who reckon it among the exceptive expressions (ML) : (f) this tradition is related with Fatḥ or the sign of the *gen.* in <sup>بَلَدٍ</sup>, and in both cases with <sup>مِنْ</sup> : the version with the *gen.* has been explained by IHsh ; and in the version with Fatḥ <sup>بَلَدٍ</sup> is [*uninfl.*] i. q. <sup>كَيْفَ</sup>, and <sup>مَا</sup> infinitival, the *pron.* in <sup>عَلَيْهِ</sup> relating to the treasure, i. e. *How*, and *Whence*, shall be your becoming acquainted with it? (Dm) : (4) as held by Akh, [and transmitted from him by IUK (Dm),] a *prep.* (IY, R, Dm), like <sup>عَدَا</sup> [512] (IY, R), <sup>خَلَا</sup> (R), and <sup>حَاشَى</sup> [511] (IY), i. q. <sup>سَوَى</sup> [89] ; and hence, as is said, the saying of the Prophet <sup>مَا أَطَّلَعْتُمْ عَلَيْهِ</sup> <sup>بَلَدٍ</sup> *besides what I have acquainted them with* (R).

§ 193. **فَعَالٌ** [*uninfl.* upon Kasr (Mb)] is [commonly held to be] always *fem.*, *det.*, and made to deviate from its proper form (Mb, IY). It is of 4 kinds, (1) [a verbal n. (Mb, IY, R), i. q. the *imp.* (M),] like **نَزَالٌ** *Alight* (Mb, M, R). i. q. **انْزِلْ** [187] (Mb, IY, R), **دَرَاكٌ** *Overtake*, [i. q. **اُدْرِكْ** (IY),] and [ **بَدَاكٌ** (IY)] **بَدَاكٌ** [said in battle (IY)], i. e. *Let each of you take his adversary* (M) : (a) according to S, it is universal in the *tril.* [below] (M, R), because of its frequency : but it is said [by Mb (R)] to be confined to hearsay, since no one may invent a form not spoken by the Arabs (IY, R), nor may we act upon analogy in the intensive forms ; while An says that Mb's disallowance is strong ; and therefore it is better to interpret what S says by supposing that by *universality* he means *frequency*, so that **فَعَالٌ** is quasi-regular because of its frequency (R) : **فَعَالٌ** as an *imp.* does not occur in the Revelation, except in the reading of AlHasan **لَا مَسَاسِيْ** XX. 97. *Touch me not* [below], which in the prefixion of **لَا** to the verbal n. is like their saying to the stumbler, when they imprecate upon him that he may not recover his footing, [ **لَا لَعَا** (MAd)] **لَا لَعَا** *Mayst thou not recover thy footing !* (Sh) : (c) it is rare in the *quad.* (M) ; and is then **فَعَالٌ**, not **فَعَالٌ** (IY) : they are

agreed that (R) only two words of it occur in the *quad.*,  
vid. قَرَقَرٌ (IY, R), i. e. قَرَقَرٌ (IY), as

قَالَتْ لَهُ رِيحٌ أَسْمَا قَرَقَارٍ \* وَاخْتَلَطَ الْمَعْرُوفُ بِالْأَنْكَارِ

[*The breeze of the east wind said to it (the cloud) "Rumble (with thunder)" : and the ground wet with rain became bleaded with the dry (AAz)*]; and [عَرَعَارٌ (IY, R), i. e. *Play at العرعة*, which is a game of theirs (R)], as

مَتَكَنَّفِي جَنْبِي عَكَطٌ كَلْبُهُمَا \* يَدْعُو بِهَا وَلَدَانَهُمَا عَرَعَارٌ

(M, R), by AnNābigha adhDhubayānī, *Surrounding the two sides of 'Ukāz, both of them, while their lads call out in it, Play at العرعة* (ABk): Mb says that deviation [from the *imp. v.* to the *imp. verbal n.*] does not occur in the *quad.* at all, قَرَقَرٌ being only an *imitation of the sound of thunder*, and عَرَعَارٌ an *imitation of the cries of boys*, as غَاقٍ غَاقٍ [200] is said; but Sf replies that what S says is better, because in *imitation of sound* the 1st does not differ from the 2nd, as غَاقٍ غَاقٍ, so that, if they meant *imitation*, they would say قَارٍ قَارٍ and عَارٍ عَارٍ; while, according to Akh [in the Book of Etymology (AAz)], فَعَالٌ as an *imp. [verbal n.]* from the *quad.* is regular, [because *intensiveness* is not peculiar to the *tril.* (AAz)]: (d) the GG hold that this فَعَالٌ is made to deviate from

the verbal *imp.* for the sake of *intensiveness*, 'this intensive form for the *imp.* being like the intensive <sup>فَعَالٌ</sup> and <sup>فَعُولٌ</sup> for <sup>فَاعِلٌ</sup> : Jj says " the o. f. of نَزَال is أَنْزَلَ أَنْزَلَ " 3 or more ; and, 3 or more being *pl.*, and the *pl.* " being *fem.*, أَنْزَلِي is said : they affix the ي, which is the " *pron.* of the *fem.*, to the *v.* as an indication of the triple " repetition, as they affix the ا in أَقْبَىٰ فِي جَهَنَّمَ L. 23. " *Cast, cast thou into Hell* [233] as an indication of the " double repetition, its o. f. being أَقْبَىٰ أَقْبَىٰ, [like يَا " (607) (K)] ; and what is meant by the " repetition is *intensiveness* : and afterwards they make " نَزَال deviate from أَنْزَلِي, so that نَزَال is then *fem.*, like " أَنْزَلِي ; and the evidence of the feminization of the " *imp.* فَعَال is the saying [of Zuhair (Ahl)]

وَلَأَنْتَ أَشَجَعُ مِنِّي أَسَامَةً أَنْ \* دُعِيتَ نَزَالٍ وَلَجٍ فِي الدَّعْرِ

" *And assuredly thou art braver than the lion when Alight* " *has been called out, and fright has been excited* " : but, in my opinion, the verbal *n.*'s being made to deviate from the form of the *v.* is a thing that they have no evidence of ; and, the general rule being that every [expression] made to deviate from some thing does not pass out of the species to which that thing belongs, the *v.* cannot by deviation pass from the quality of *v.* to that of *n.* : and,



as for the *intensiveness*, it exists in all the verbal *ns.*, as we explained before [187], not in the manner asserted by Jj; and the femininization of the *v.* in دُعِيَتْ نَزَالٌ does not prove the *o. f.* of نَزَالٌ to be an *imp. v.* repeated, but is due to the paraphrase of نَزَالٌ by the كَلِمَةٌ or لَفْظَةٌ or دَعْوَةٌ : (e) similarly the 2 kinds of the *inf. n.* and *ep.* are not devoid of the sense of *intensiveness* [194], so that حَمَادٌ and كَنَاعٌ are more intensive than الْحَمْدُ and الْكَعَامُ (R): (2) made to deviate from (Mb), [and therefore] in the sense of (M), a [*det. (M) fem. (IY)*] *inf. n.* (Mb, M, R), being a proper name for it (IY), like فَجَارٌ *Wickedness* [a proper name (IY)] for الْفَجْرَةُ [8], جَمَادٌ for الْجَمُودُ [below], and حَمَادٌ for الْمَحْمُودَةُ (M), as

أَنَا اقْتَسَمْنَا خُطَيْنَا بَيْنَنَا \* فَحَمَلْتُ بَرَّةً وَاحْتَمَلْتُ فَجَارِ

by AnNābigħa [adhDhubyānī (Mb, ABk), *Verily we have divided our qualities between us; and I have borne off goodness, and thou hast carried away wickedness* (ABk), i. e. الْفَجْرَةُ (IY)], and

جَمَادٌ لَهَا جَمَادٌ وَلَا تَقُولِي \* طَوَالَ الدَّهْرِ مَا ذُكِرْتُ حَمَادٌ

[by AlMutalammiṣ (Akh, IY), *blaming wine* (Akh),]

“*Stagnation*” (say thou) to it, “*stagnation*”; and say thou not (to it), *throughout the length of time, so long as*

it is mentioned, "Praise," i. e. قَرَأَى لَهَا جُمُودًا وَلَا تَقُولِي لَهَا  
حَمْدًا (Mb, IY), this being the sense, though it is made to  
deviate as a [det.] fem. [above] (Mb) : and hence بَدَأَ ,  
as in

وَذَكَرْتَ مِنْ لَبَنِ الْمَكْلِقِ شُرْبَةً \* وَالْأَخِيلَ تَعْدُو فِي الصَّعِيدِ بَدَأِ  
[below], by 'Auf [Ibn 'Aṭīya (KF)] Ibn AlKhari' ['Amr  
Ibn 'Abs (KF)], *And thou rememberedst a draught of the  
milk of the herd of camels branded with a mark like a  
ring, when the horses were running on the surface of the  
ground dispersed*, i. e. بَدَأَ i. q. مَتَّبِعِدَةً, an inf. n. i. q.  
the act. part., like عَدِلَ i. q. عَادِلٌ [76, 143], being really  
a [generic proper] name for a det. fem. inf. n., like الْبَدَّةُ ,  
even if such an inf. n. has not been spoken, as though  
it were an abandoned o. f. ; and similarly in

كُنَّا ثَمَانِيَةً وَكَانُوا جَحْفَلًا \* لَجِبًا فَشَكُّوا بِالرِّمَاحِ بَدَأِ

by Ḥassān [Ibn Thābit, describing the day of Dhū Ḳarad  
(SR)], *We were eight, and they were a noisy host :  
and they were pierced with the spears, when dispersed*,

i. e. مَتَّبِعِدِينَ ; for the d. s. may occur det. when it is  
an inf. n., as ارْسَلَهَا الْعِرَاقُ and طَاقَتَكَ and فَعَلَتَكَ جَهْدَكَ

[78] (IY) : (a) they say "[made to deviate from (AAz)]  
a det. fem. inf. n." ; but to me no decisive evi-  
dence of its determination or femininization has yet

presented itself : they hold, however, that it is [*det.* as being] one of the [generic] proper names for *id.* objects, like [زُورٌ, بُرَّةٌ] [8], and سُبْحَانٌ, بُرَّةٌ being a proper name for *all goodness*, and نُجَارٌ for *all wickedness* (Akh)] ; and sometimes the femininization of the verbal *n.* and *inf. n.* is argued, upon the ground of uniformity, from the femininization of the *ep.* and personal proper name, which are *fem.*, as will be seen ; but this argument is wonderful : (b) نُجَارٌ is said to be *det.* in اِنَّا اَقْتَسَمْنَا الْخَ [above] because of the determination of its companion, vid. بُرَّةٌ ; but this argument is like the 1st in strangeness, since assimilation of one word to another in determination or femininization notwithstanding that the word assimilated is not used *det.* or *fem.* is a novelty : if indeed qualification of such as نُجَارٌ by the *det. fem.*, as نُجَارٌ الْقَبِيحَةُ, were authentic, it would be a good argument for both matters, determination and femininization : (c) even if we admit [that نُجَارٌ is *det.*], there is no evidence of the determinateness of its sisters ; and in their saying about the gazelles اِنَّا وَرَدْتِ الْمَاءَ فَلَا عَابَ وَ اِنَّا لَمْ تَرِدْ فَلَا اَبَابٌ When they come down to the water, there is no drinking deeply ; and, when they come not down, there is no yearning (for it), i. e. فَلَا عَابٌ and فَلَا

أَب meaning لَا نَزَاعَ إِلَيْهِ, and the saying of AlMutalammis  
 قُولِي لَهَا جُمُودًا آخِ [as above], i. e. جَمَادٍ لَهَا آخِ [above],  
 and the saying of the Arabs لَا مَسَاسِي No touching!  
 [above], i. e. لَا مَسَى, the indeterminateness is obvious :  
 (d) according to those who hold that all the measures of  
 فُعَال, *imp.*, *inf. n.*, *ep.*, and proper name, are *fem.*, they  
 must, when used as [proper] names for a *masc.* [194],  
 be diptote, like عَنَّا; whereas, according to the GG,  
 they may be triptote, like صَبَاحُ; and this shows how the  
 GG vacillate about their being *fem.* (R): (3) made to  
 deviate from (M) a [*fem.* (IY, R) prevalent (Mb, IY)]  
*ep.*, [which occupies the place of a substantive (149)  
 (Mb): this *ep.* does not occur in the *masc.*, is always  
 used without a qualified, and is moreover of two kinds  
 (R),] (a) used [(a) in most cases (IY) only (IY, R)] in  
 the *voc.*, [according to hearsay (R),] as يَا فَسَّاقُ [56. A],  
 يَا خَبِيثَةً, يَا فَاسِقَةً (Mb, M, R), i. e. يَا خَبَاتِ  
 and يَا لَكَأَمٍّ (Mb, R), because in the *voc.* it is in the  
 position of a *det.* (Mb), since the *voc.* becomes *det.* by  
 specific intention, like يَا رَجُلٌ in رَجُلٌ [48]; (b) some-  
 times in the *non-voc.*, by poetic license, as أُطَوِّفُ [497]  
 (IY): (a) this فُعَال and the *imp.* فُعَال may be formed  
 with universal regularity from every *tril.* [above] *att.*

[completely (MKh) plastic (MKh, MAd)] *v.*, as نَزَالٌ, ذَهَابٌ, and كَتَابٌ from نَزَلَ, ذَهَبَ, and كَتَبَ, and as زَنَى, فَجَرَ, and فَسَقَ from يَا زَنَاءَ, يَا فَجَارَ, and يَا فَسَاقَ: but not from such as اللِّصَوِصِيَّةُ, because it has no *v.*: nor from such as دَحْرَجَ, اسْتَخْرَجَ, and انْطَلَقَ, because they exceed three letters, [such as ادْرَكَكَ from دَرَاكَ being confined to hearsay (MKh)]; nor from such as طَلَّ, كَانَ, بَاتَ, and صَارَ, because they are *non-att.* (Sh); nor from such as نَعِمَ and بُئْسَ, [because they are aplastic] (MAd); nor from such as يَنْذِرُ and يَدْعُ [482], because they are not completely plastic (MKh): (β) this kind, which is used only in the *voc.*, does not occur as a generic proper name [7], i. e. does not, by prevalence of application to a [particular] qualified, become a proper name for it (R): (b) used in the *non-voc.*, [which is of two kinds, (a) what by prevalence of application becomes a generic proper name, like أَسَامَةُ (7), which is the more numerous (R),] as حَلَاقٍ [and جَبَانٌ (M, R)] for *Fate* (Mb, M, R), made to deviate from حَالِقَةٌ and جَابِذَةٌ (AAz), *orig. general eps.* for all that *shears* and *drags away*, and afterwards, by prevalence of application, peculiar to the genus of *The Fates*

(R) ; and [similarly (R)] حَنَانٌ and بُرَاجٌ for *The sun* [from  
 الحَنَنُ *roasting* and البُرَاجُ *setting* (R)] ; and سَبَاطٌ for *Fever*,  
 [because of its *spreading* through the body, from الشَّعْرُ  
 لَانٌ *Lank hair* (R)] ; and [many others, like (R)] كَرَارٌ  
 for *The bead that the woman charms her husband with* !,  
 [which is named كَرَارٌ because by their assertion it re-  
 stores the husband (R),] whence their saying يَا كَرَارُ كَرِّبْهُ  
 اِنْ اَذْبَرَ فَرْدِيَّةً وَاِنْ اَقْبَلَ فُسْرِيَّةً *O charm, restore him : if*  
*he depart, bring him back ; and, if he approach, make*  
*him glad ; and كَوَيْتَهُ وَقَاعٌ I branded him with the وَقَاعُ*,  
 which is [the proper name of (R)] a [particular (AAz)]  
 brand upon the two haunches (M, R), or along the head  
 from its front to its back (M), in the acc. as an inf. n. to  
 كَوَيْتَهُ, i. e. كَيْتَهُ وَقَاعَةً meaning لَازِمَةٌ (R), whence

وَكُنْتُ اِنْ اَمْنَيْتُ بِخَصْمِ سَوِيٍّ \* دَلَقْتُ لَهٗ فَاكْوِيَةً وَقَاعِ

(M), by 'Auf Ibn AlAhwas (IY, AAz), *And I was wont,*  
*when I was tried by a foe of evil, to stalk up to him, and*  
*brand him indelibly* (AAz) ; and جَعَارٌ, [قَتَامٌ, and فُشَاحٌ  
 (R)] for the *she-hyena* [below] (Mb, R) : these [expres-  
 sions (IY), and their likes (R), (among which IY in-  
 cludes those given below under (b) except بَدَايُ, which  
 he places above among the inf. ns.), though orig. eps.

(IY),] are [used as (IY) generic (R)] proper names (IY, R); and are therefore *det.* (IY), as is proved by their qualification by the *det.*, as <sup>حَنَانُ</sup> <sup>الطَّالِعَةِ</sup> *The rising sun* (R): and [(b) what remains an *ep.* (R),] as <sup>قُطَامًا</sup>, [i. e. <sup>قَاتَاةٌ</sup> <sup>كَافِيَةٌ</sup> (R),] whence

<sup>أُطَلِّتُ</sup> <sup>فِرَاطَهُمْ</sup> <sup>حَتَّى</sup> <sup>إِنَّمَا</sup> \* <sup>قَتَلْتُ</sup> <sup>سِرَاتَهُمْ</sup> <sup>كَانَتْ</sup> <sup>قُطَامًا</sup>

[by 'Amr Ibn Ma'dikarib, when his mother had been killed by a tribe of the Arabs, *I prolonged the period of my forbearance with their hasty deed, until, when I had slain their chiefs, it (the <sup>قَتْلُهُ</sup> slaughter) was sufficient for me (AAz)*]; and <sup>سَبَبْتُكَ</sup> <sup>سَبَّةٌ</sup> <sup>تَكُونُ</sup> <sup>لَزَامٌ</sup> *I reproached him with a reproach that will be indelible*, i. e. <sup>لَزِمَةٌ</sup>; and <sup>لَا</sup> <sup>تُبَلِّغُنِي</sup> <sup>فُلَانًا</sup> <sup>عِنْدِي</sup> <sup>بَلَالٌ</sup>, i. e. <sup>بَالَةٌ</sup> (M, R), meaning *A bounty shall not light upon such an one near me, nor a benefit reach him from me*; and <sup>وَالْخَيْلُ</sup> <sup>تَعْدُو</sup> <sup>أَلْفٌ</sup> [above], i. e. <sup>مَتَبَدِّدَةٌ</sup> <sup>مَتَفَرِّقَةٌ</sup>, so that it is a *d. s.* [78, 140] (R): (4) made to deviate from <sup>فَاعِلَةٌ</sup> in (M) a [personal (R) proper (M, R)] name [of a woman or *fem.* thing (Mb)], as <sup>حَذَامٌ</sup> [194], <sup>قُطَامٌ</sup> (Mb, M, R), <sup>رُقَاشٍ</sup> (Mb), <sup>سُجَاحٍ</sup> (R), and the like, made to deviate from <sup>حَازِمَةٌ</sup>, <sup>قَاطِمَةٌ</sup>, etc., when used as names (Mb) for [certain (R)] *women* (M, R), <sup>سُجَاحٍ</sup>

being for the *woman* [of the Banū Yarbū' (IY)] *who set up for a Prophetess* (M) in the time of Musailima (IY); كَسَاب [6] and خُطَاف for 2 *bitches* (M, R); قَتَام, جَعَار, and فَشَاح for the *she-hyena* [above]; خَصَاف and سَكَاب for 2 *horses* (M), خَصَاف for a *stallion*, as in the prov. أَجْرَا <sup>٢٨٤</sup> *Bolder than the gelder of Khaṣāf*, because one of the kings [AlMundhir Ibn Imra alKais (KF)] demanded him for covering from his owner [a man of Bāhila, said by Abu-nNadā to have been Ḥamal Ibn Yazīd Ibn Dhuhl Ibn Tha'labā (Md)], who refused and castrated him [in the presence of that king (Md)], and سَكَاب for a *mare* (R); عَرَار for a *cow* (M, R), as in the prov. [applied to every pair of equals (Md, IY)] بَاوَتْ عَرَارٌ بِكَحْلٍ, *Arāri was slain for Kaḥl* (M), they being 2 *cows* that gored each other to death (Md, IY); وَبَار and شَرَاف for 2 *countries*; and لَصَاف (M, R) for a *mountain* (M), an *abode of the Banū Tamīm* (IY, R), as قَدْ كُنْتُ الْخ [below]: (a) this kind [of proper name] is coined [4,194] because it is not made to deviate before its use as a proper name corresponding to an object, and afterwards transferred to the *cat.* of proper name; and the difference between this kind and the preceding one [3, b, a] is that in this kind the sense of *qualificativity* is lost sight of, whereas in the preceding one *qualificativity* is meant [194] (IY): (b) all (R) these expressions



are *fem.* (Mb, R), even if the [person or thing] named by them be *masc.*; and in the saying

قَدْ كُنْتُ أَحْسِبُكُمْ اسْرُونَ خَفِيَّةً \* فَإِذَا أَصَافُ تَبْيِضُ فِيهِ الْحَمَرُ

*I have been wont to account you to be lions of a thicket ;*  
and lo ! in *Laṣāf* the larks lay eggs ! the *pron.* of أَصَافُ

is made *masc.* because it is renderable by the مَوْضِعُ ; and there is another version فِيهَا , [as in the Bk and IY] :

(c) sometimes such *fems.* as these are used as names for a man, like سَعَانُ and زَيْنَبُ (R).

§ 194. IM says in the Tashīl “ They are agreed “ that [the ل of ] فَعَالٌ , when an *imp.*, *inf. n.*, *d. s.*, or “ *ep.* used as a proper name or only as a *voc.*, is pronounced with Kasr ; and each of them is made to deviate “ from a *fem.*: so that, if one of them be used as a [proper] name for a *masc.* [193], it is like عُنَاقٌ ”, i. e. diptote ; “ but is sometimes made like صَبَاحٌ ”, i. e. triptote: “ and, if it be used as a [proper] name for a *fem.*, “ it is like رَقَاشِي [193] ” (YS). [The ل of ] فَعَالٌ in the *imp.* is pronounced with Fatḥ by the Banū Asad (R, Sh), for affinity to the ل and Fatḥa before it (Sh). The *inf. ns.* and *eps.* are *uninfl.* by common consent, because of their resemblance to the *imp.* فَعَالٌ [159] in *measure* and *intensiveness* [193]. The generic proper names

ought to be *infl.*, because the *uninfl.* word, when used as a [proper] name for something other than its form, must be *infl.*, as when a person is named <sup>٩٨٤</sup>أَيْن; [and may not be imitated, as when it is used as a (proper) name for the form (191), because in the former case you do not observe its original meaning, on account of which it is *orig. uninfl.*, but totally exclude it therefrom, whereas, when you make it a (proper) name for the form, you do observe its meaning in some respect, since the meaning of <sup>٩٨٤</sup>أَيْنَ تَنْصِبُ وَتَرْفَعُ, whose meaning is *verification, governs the nom. and acc.* (R on the proper name)] : but they are *uninfl.* because the generic proper names [7] are [only] *lit.* proper names, [which have the predicament of proper names in letter, such as diptote declension, anarthrousness, and prefixion of <sup>٩٨٤</sup>أَب and <sup>٩٨٤</sup>أَم, as in the surnames of human beings, and occur as *ss. s*, and are qualified by *dets.*, but notwithstanding all this are applicable to the *indet.* (R on the proper name)] ; so that the sense of *qualification* remains in all of them [193], since they are prevalent *quals.* (R). As for the [personal (R)] proper names [of *fems.*, they have 3 *dial. vars.* (Sh):] (1) according to the people of AlḤijāz, they are *uninfl.* (R, Sh) upon Kasr, unrestrictedly, [i. e. whether they end in *ج* or not (YS),] as

إِذَا قَالَتْ حَذَامٌ فَصَدَّقُوهَا \* فَإِنَّ الْقَوْلَ مَا قَالَتْ حَذَامٌ

(Sh), by Lujaim Ibn Ṣaʿb, *When Ḥadhām* (the wife of the poet) *says a saying, then believe ye her: for verily the true saying is what Ḥadhām has said* (Jsh): their making these names *uninfl.* is contrary to analogy, since *qualification* has no meaning in them, so that the *uninflectedness* belonging to them in the state of *qualification* might be observed; but, seeing that there is no contradiction between *qualification* and the *quality of proper name* as respects the sense, they make them *uninfl.* like the *quals.*, although they are coined [193], not transferred from *quals.*, in order to treat them like the proper name transferred from the *qual.*, because it is more numerous than the other (R): (2) according to a few of the Banū Tamīm, they are *infl.* as diptotes (R, Sh), unrestrictedly (Sh), in conformity with analogy, being *infl.* because denuded of the sense of *qualification*, and diptote because of the *quality of proper name* and *femininization* in them [18] (R): (3) according to most of them [and to their chaste speakers (R)], they are *uninfl.* [upon Kasr (Sh), with a view to Imāla (634) (R),] if they end in ر; and diptote if they do not end in ر (R, Sh): the poet says مَتَى تَرَدْنَ الْخَمَّ [64]; and AlAʿshā [Maimūn Ibn Kaīs (MAd), whose abode was in AlYamāma with the Banū Tamīm (IY),] says, combining the two Tamīmī *dials.*,

أَلَمْ تَرَوْا إِرْمًا وَعَادًا \* أَوْدَى بِهَا اللَّيْلُ وَالنَّهَارُ  
وَمَرَّ دَهْرٌ عَلَى دُبَارٍ \* فَهَلَكْتَ جَهْرَةً وَدُبَارَ

(Sh) *Saw ye not Iram and 'Ād ? The night and the day destroyed them. And a time passed over Wabār, and Wabār perished openly* (AAz).

§ 195. هِيَهَات is pronounced with Fath of the م [in the *dial.* of the people of AlHijāz (M)], Kasr [in the *dial.* of Asad and Tamīm (M)], and Damm [by some of the Arabs (M)]. Sometimes its [1st (R, AAz)] ه is changed into Hamza, [also with triple vocalization of the م (R)]; and sometimes it is pronounced with Tanwīn (M, R) in these 6 *dial. vars.* (R). It is read with all 3 vowels [in XXIII. 38. (504), with and without Tanwīn (K, B) : for Fath is the general well-known reading, and with Tanwīn is transmitted from AlA'raj ; Kasr without Tanwīn is the reading of Abū Ja'far athThaḡafī, and with Tanwīn is read by IIU ; and Damm with Tanwīn is the reading of Abū Haiwa, and without Tanwīn is said to be read by Ka'nab (IY)] : the poet says

تَذَكَّرْتُ أَيَّامًا مُضِيًّا مِنْ الصَّبِي  
هِيَهَاتَ هِيَهَاتَ إِلَيْكَ رَجُوعَهَا

[*Thou hast called to mind days of boyhood that have passed : then far, far off is their return to thee !* (AAz)] : and the saying of the poet [describing *camels* (IY)]

يُصْبِحْنَ بِالْقَفَرِ نَادِيَاتٍ \* هِيَهَاتَ مِنْ مُصْبِحِهَا هِيَهَاتَ

[*They become in the desert wending their way : far, far off is their place, or time, of entering upon the morning !*,  
 being red (AAz),] is related with Damm of the 1st and Kasr of the 2nd (M). Some make the ت quiescent [even in continuity (R), as هَيْهَاتَ هَيْهَاتَ, which is read {in XXIII. 38. (K, B)} by 'Īsā alHamdānī, and is a version transmitted from IAl (IY)]; some elide the ت, [as هَيْهَاتَ (IY, R); some make it a ن (M), as هَيْهَاتَ (IY)]; and some say أَيِهَاتَ, [أَيِهَاتَ with Tanwīn (R),] أَيِهَاتَ [with the ك of allocution (IY, R)], and أَيِهَاتَ (M, R) with a Hamza and ن both pronounced with Fath, but, as the author of the Mughnī says, with a ن pronounced with Kasr (R). Sgh cites 36 *dial. vars.* of it, هَيْهَاتَ and أَيِهَاتَ, هَيْهَاتَ and أَيِهَاتَ, and هَيْهَاتَ and أَيِهَاتَ, each of these six pronounced with Damm, Fath, or Kasr of the final, and each [of these 18] pronounced with or without Tanwīn; and others cite هَيْهَاتَ and أَيِهَاتَ, هَيْهَاتَ and أَيِهَاتَ, and هَيْهَاتَ and أَيِهَاتَ (A), making the total 42; and the KF adds 13 others, هَيْهَاتَ and أَيِهَاتَ, and هَيْهَاتَ and أَيِهَاتَ, with Kasr of the ن because of the 2 quiescents, and with triple vocalization of the final, and أَيِهَاتَ with charge of the two 8s into Hamzas (Sn). According to

[some of (R)] the GG, (1) the one pronounced with Fatḥ [of the ت (IY, R)] is *sing.* [646], its ت denoting *femininization*, and its *o. f.* being هَيْهَيْتَ<sup>٩ ٨ ٨ ٨</sup>; (2) the one pronounced with Kasr [of the ت (R)] is the [sound (IY)] *pl.* of the one pronounced with Fatḥ, its *o. f.* being هَيْهَيْات<sup>٩ ٨ ٨ ٨</sup> [234], and its ُ being then elided (M, R), because it is *indecl.*; (3) the one pronounced with Damm of the ت may be *sing.* or *pl.*: but this is all imagination and conjecture. The ت is pronounced with Fatḥ in most cases, from regard to its *o. f.* when it was an unrestricted *obj.* [187, 199]; with Kasr because of the two quiescents [664]; and with Damm to notify by the strength of the vowel the strength of the meaning of *farness* in it, since its meaning is *How far (he, or it) is!* [187] (R). When pronounced with Damm, it is written, according to F, with the ت; but, according to IJ, with the ڤ (A).

§ 196. شَتَانُ<sup>٩ ٨ ٨ ٨</sup> is i. q. اِفْتَرَقَ<sup>٩ ٨ ٨ ٨</sup> [187] with *wonder*, i. e. *How different!*; and therefore requires two *ags.*, like اِفْتَرَقَ<sup>٩ ٨ ٨ ٨</sup>, as شَتَانُ زَيْدٌ وَعَمْرُو<sup>٩ ٨ ٨ ٨</sup> *How different are Zaid and 'Amr!* (R). مَا may be redundantly inserted [after it (R), before the *ag.* (Sh), as شَتَانُ مَا زَيْدٌ وَعَمْرُو<sup>٩ ٨ ٨ ٨</sup> (565) (R), whence

شَتَانُ مَا نَوْمِي عَلَى كُورِهَا \* وَنَوْمُ حَيَّانِ أَخِي جَابِرٍ

(Sh), by Al A'shà, *How different are my sleep upon her saddle in the desert and the sleep of Hayyān the brother of Jābir !* (MAd)]. And <sup>أَبِي</sup>شَتَانُ <sup>زَيْدٍ</sup>مَا <sup>وَعَمْرُو</sup> is said [in the less frequent and less chaste usage (R)], as

لَشَتَانُ مَا بَيْنَ الْيَزِيدِيَيْنِ فِي النَّدَى  
يَزِيدٍ سَلِيمٍ وَالْأَعْرَابِيِّ حَاتِمٍ

(R, Sh), by Rabī'a [Ibn Thābit alAsadi (IKhn)] arRaḳḳī, [(By God,) *how different are, or how far is that (distance) which is between* (MKh), *or how far is the separation of* (MAd), *the two Yazīds in munificence* (MKh, MAd), *Yazīd Ibn Usaīd of Sulaim and the illustrious Yazīd Ibn Hātim* (MAd) alMuhallabī! (IY, IKhn),] this being allowable upon the ground that [ <sup>أَبِي</sup>مَا is red., and <sup>أَبِي</sup>الْيَزِيدِيَيْنِ an ag. constructively in the *nom.* ; or that (MKh)] <sup>أَبِي</sup>شَتَانُ is i. q. <sup>أَبِي</sup>بَعْدُ, because the latter does not require two or more *ags.*, and <sup>أَبِي</sup>مَا [conjunct (MKh),] a *met.* for <sup>أَبِي</sup>الْبُرُونِ or <sup>أَبِي</sup>المَسَافَةِ, [ag. of <sup>أَبِي</sup>شَتَانُ (MKh),] i. e. *How far is that (interval or distance) which is between them !* ; or that <sup>أَبِي</sup>شَتَانُ is i. q. <sup>أَبِي</sup>بَعْدُ ; and <sup>أَبِي</sup>مَا red., as it is without <sup>أَبِي</sup>بَيْنِ, and <sup>أَبِي</sup>بَيْنِ ag. of <sup>أَبِي</sup>شَتَانُ, in accordance with the opinion of Akh on <sup>أَبِي</sup>يَفْصَلُ بَيْنَكُمْ LX. 3. *Your union shall be severed*, where <sup>أَبِي</sup>بَيْنَكُمْ [159], says he, is the subject, but is not put into the

*nom.* from disapproval of its exclusion from the *acc.* permanently belonging to it in most of its usage (R). It is disallowed, however, by As (R, Sh), who says that the poem is post-classical, because he holds that شَتَانٌ is *du.* of شَتَّ separate, an *enunc.* of what follows it, [not a verbal *n. i. q.* افْتَرَقَ (YS, MAd),] he being misled by two things, a *dial. var.* with Kasr of the ن [187] and the fact that the *nom.* after it is only a *du.* or *i. q.* the *du.*, not a *pl.*, [the last three in شَتَانٌ هَذَا الْخ (187) being in the predicament of one, i. e. شَتَانٌ هَذَا وَذَاكَ (AAz)]; whereas, if it were *i. q.* افْتَرَقَ, the *pl.* might occur as *ag.* of it: but the chaster *dial. var.* with Fath of the ن falsifies his opinion; and also, if شَتَانٌ were an *enunc.*, it might be posterior to the *inch.*, since there is nothing to necessitate its priority [28], whereas it has not been heard posterior (R). But, as for the saying of a post-classical poet

جَازَيْتُمُونِي بِالْوَصَالِ قَطِيعَةً \* شَتَانٌ بَيْنَ صَنِيعِكُمْ وَصَنِيعِي

[Ye have requited me for union with estrangement: how far is the separation of your dealing and my dealing!], بَيْنَ being *ag.* of شَتَانٌ, the construction in (MAd)] it was not used by the Arabs; and it is sometimes explained by subaudition of مَا conjoined with بَيْنَ, [i. e.



*how far is that (distance) which is between your etc.*! (MKh), مَ being an ag. (MAd),] according to the saying of the KK that suppression of the conjunct [n. other than اَلْ (MAd)] is allowable [177] {Sh}.

§ 197. اِف has the following *dial. vars.*, (1) اِفْ ; (2) اِفْ ; (3) اِفْ ; (4) اِفْ ; (5) اِنَا [187]; (6) اِفْ (M, R, KF); (7) اِفْ ; (8) اِفْ (M, R), sometimes followed by تَفْ , as تَفْ (R); (9) اِفْ (M); (10) اِفْ (R); but I do not know اِفْ [41] with the 8 of femininization [as a verbal n.]; and, if it does occur, how rare it is! (IY); (11) اِفْ (KF); (12) اِفْ (IY, KF), read by Ibn 'Abbās (IY); (13) اِفْ ; (14) اِفْ ; (15) اِنَا ; (16) اِفْ ; (17) اِفْ (KF); (18) اِفْ ; (19-21) اِنِي [with the 1 of femininization (IY, KF), upon the measure of فَعْلَى (IY),] pronounced [without Imāla (KF),] with [pure (KF)] Imāla (IY, R, KF), and betwixt and between (KF); (22) اِنِي (IY, KF) with Kasr (KF), said by the vulgar (IY); (23) اِفْوَهْ ; (24) اِفْ ; (25) اِفْ ; (26) اِفْ ; (27) اِفْ (KF); (28) اِفْ (R, KF); (29) اِفْ ; (30) اِفْ ; (31) اِفْ ; (32) اِفْ ; (33) اِفْ ; (34) اِنَا ; (35) اِنَا ; (36) اِفْ ; (37) اِنَا , like اِنَا ;

(38) اَفَى with Imāla ; (39) اَفَى with Kasr ; (40) اَفْ ; (41) اَفْ ; (42) اَفْ ; (43) اَفْ ; (44) اَفْ (KF). It is *uninfl.* upon Kasr because of the concurrence of two quiescents; and its Tanwīn in the reading of Nāfi' and Ḥafṣ denotes *indeterminateness* [198] : Ibn Kathīr, Ibn 'Āmir, and Ya'kūb read with Fath, by way of alleviation ; and it is so read with Tanwīn : and it is read with Damm for alliteration, like مَنْذُ [203], with and without Tanwīn (B on XVII. 24).

§ 198. IM says in the CK that, since these words are *vs.* as respects the sense, but *ns.* as respects the letter, they are made *det.* and *indet.*, the sign of the *det.* being its divestment of Tanwīn [187], and the sign of the *indet.* being its use with Tanwīn ; and that, since pure *ns.* are [of three kinds,] always *det.*, like the *prons.* and *dems.*, always *indet.*, like أَحَدٌ, عَرِيبٌ, and دِيَارٌ, and sometimes *det.* and sometimes *indet.*, like رَجُلٌ and فَرَسٌ, so (A) these *ns.* are [of three kinds (M),] (1) always *det.*, like نَزَالٌ [193] (A), بَلَةٌ [192], and آمِينٌ [187] : (2) always *indet.*, like اِيْهَا in *restraint* (M), وَيْهَا [in *instigation* (M),] and وَهَّاءٌ [187] (M, A) in *wonder* ; and hence فِدَاءٌ لَكَ فُلَانٌ with Kasr and Tanwīn, i. e. لِيُقَدِّكَ, as

مَهْلًا فِدَاءٌ لَكَ الْاَقْرَامُ كُلُّهُمْ \* وَمَا اَثْمَرُ مِنْ مَالٍ وَمِنْ وَلَدٍ

(M), by AnNābigha adhDhubyānī, *Gently, let the peoples, all of them, and what I muster of wealth and of children, ransom thee!* (ABk), <sup>الاقوام</sup> being in the *nom.* as *ag.* of <sup>فداؤ</sup>, because it is i. q. <sup>لِيَقْدِكَ</sup> (IY) : (a) <sup>اِيَّهَا</sup> may be an *ej.* acting as a substitute for the *inf. n.*, *infl.*, governed in the *acc.* like <sup>سَقِيَا</sup> [41], meaning <sup>كفا</sup>, [in which case the Tanwīn is the Tanwīn of complete declension,] as <sup>اِيَّهَا عَنَا</sup> *Desist from troubling us*; or a verbal *n. uninfl.*, in which case the Tanwīn is [the Tanwīn of indeterminateness,] like that which is in <sup>صَا</sup> [below] : and similarly every Tanwīn after such of these *ns.* as are pronounced with Fath [of the final] admits of the two alternatives, as <sup>وَيَدَا</sup> [188], <sup>حَيْهَلَا</sup> [191], and <sup>وَيَهَا</sup> (R) : (b) IS says that <sup>اِيَّ</sup> without Tanwīn is allowable, but rare (IY, R) : (c) sometimes the Hamza of <sup>اِيَّ</sup> [below] and <sup>اِيَّهَا</sup> is changed into <sup>هَ</sup>, as <sup>هَيَّهَ</sup> and <sup>هَيَّهَا</sup> (R) : (d) <sup>فَدَاؤُ</sup> is *uninfl.* because of its occurrence in the place of the *imp. v.* [159], i. e. <sup>لِيَقْدِكَ</sup>; and is pronounced with Kasr because of the concurrence of two quiescents [664] (IY) : (3) used in two ways (A), *det.* and *indet.* (M), being divested of Tanwīn when intended to be *det.*, and pronounced with Tanwīn when intended to be *indet.* (A), like <sup>صَا</sup> and <sup>صَا</sup> [187, 200], <sup>اِفْ</sup> and <sup>اِفْ</sup> [197] (M,

A), اِيَّة and اِيَّة [187, 200], غَاق and غَاق [200] (M): (a) As asserts that the Arabs use only اِيَّة with Tanwīn, and charges Dhu-rRumma with error in saying وَقَفْنَا فَقُلْنَا [187] (IY, R); and IS says that he intends Tanwīn, since his meaning is *Tell a story, whatever story it be, about Umm Sālim*, but that he omits it by poetic license (R). The Tanwīn affixed to these *ajs.* only distinguishes between the *det.* and *indet.* [608], not being found in a *det.* at all; and only follows the vowels of uninflectedness, not being like the Tanwīn of زَيْد [and رَجُل], which follows the vowels of inflection in the *det.* and *indet.* (IY). What IM mentions [above] is the well-known opinion; but some hold that all the verbal *ns.*, with or without Tanwīn, are *det.* with the determination of the generic proper name [187] (A).

§ 199. Among the verbal *ns.* are *adv.* and their likes, governing in the *gen.* a *pron.* mostly of the 2nd *pers.*, anomalously and seldom of the 3rd, as in the saying عَلَيْهِ شَحْصًا لَيْسَنِي [164] and the saying of the Prophet مَنْ أَشْتَهَى مِنْكُمْ الْبَاءَةَ فَعَلَيْهِ بِالصَّوْمِ فَإِنَّ لَهُ وَجَاءَ *Whoso of you lusteth after copulation, let him keep to fasting, for verily it hath the effect of gelding by compression of the two testicles* (R). IM says in the CK that this sort is not used except conjoined with the *pron.* of the 2nd

pers.; and that <sup>رَجُلًا</sup> عَلَيْهِ i. q. <sup>لِيَلْزَمَ</sup> [164], <sup>أَلَى</sup> عَلَى i. q. <sup>أَوَّلِيَّةً</sup> and <sup>أَلَى</sup> إِلَى i. q. <sup>أَتَنَكَّى</sup> are anomalous: but his language in the Tashīl implies that these are not anomalous (A). <sup>عِنْدَكَ</sup> عِنْدَكَ, <sup>لَدَيْكَ</sup> لَدَيْكَ, and <sup>دُونَكَ</sup> دُونَكَ mean *Take*. The o. f. is <sup>عِنْدَكَ</sup> عِنْدَكَ <sup>زَيْدٌ</sup> زَيْدٌ <sup>فَتُخَذَ</sup> فَتُخَذَ *Beside thee is Zaid: then take him*, and similarly <sup>زَيْدٌ</sup> زَيْدٌ <sup>لَدَيْكَ</sup> لَدَيْكَ and <sup>دُونَكَ</sup> دُونَكَ زَيْدٌ, what follows them being put into the *nom.* as an *inch.*; but afterwards it is abridged from the nominal and subsequent verbal *prop.* to the *adv.*, which is then so often used that it becomes i. q. <sup>خَذَ</sup> خَذَ, and therefore governs with its government: while the *advs.* are *uninfl.* upon *Fath*, because it is the vowel appropriate to them in their o. f. when they were *advs.*, as we said of the *inf. ns.* that become verbal *ns.* [188, 195]; and they have no place [in inflection], like those *inf. ns.*, because they act as substitutes for what has no place [187] (R). <sup>وَرَاءَكَ</sup> وَرَاءَكَ means *Keep back*, and <sup>أَمَامَكَ</sup> أَمَامَكَ *Advance* (R, A) or *Be on thy guard from the direction of thy front*: but these may be said to remain *advs.*, since they do not govern an *obj.* in the *acc.* [but see § 187], like <sup>عِنْدَكَ</sup> عِنْدَكَ and <sup>لَدَيْكَ</sup> لَدَيْكَ; and in that case the full phrase is <sup>أَسْتَقِرَّ</sup> أَسْتَقِرَّ <sup>لَدَيْكَ</sup> لَدَيْكَ and in that case the full phrase is <sup>أَثْبَتَ</sup> أَثْبَتَ <sup>مَكَانَكَ</sup> مَكَانَكَ and <sup>وَرَاءَكَ</sup> وَرَاءَكَ [498] (R). And <sup>مَكَانَكَ</sup> مَكَانَكَ means <sup>أَثْبَتَ</sup> أَثْبَتَ <sup>مَكَانَكُمْ</sup> مَكَانَكُمْ [420] (IY, A), so that it is *intrans.* (Sn), as <sup>مَكَانَكُمْ</sup> مَكَانَكُمْ <sup>أَنْتُمْ</sup> أَنْتُمْ

وَشُرَكَاءُكُمْ X. 29. *Stand fast, ye and your partners*, like  
 اثْبَتُوا أَنْتُمْ الْخ [158] (IY); and the KK transmit it as *trans.*,  
 e. g. مَكَانَكَ زَيْدًا *Wait for Zaid*, i. e. اِنْتَظِرْهُ : but Dm  
 says “ I know not what need there is to make this sort of  
 “ *adv.* a verbal *n.*, nor why they do not make it an *adv.*;  
 “ for the assertion of the verbal *n.* is good only where  
 “ the combination of that [*n*] and that *v.* is impossible,  
 “ as in صَدَّ , عَلَيْكَ , and إِلَيْكَ , not where it is possible ;  
 “ whereas اَثْبَتَ مَكَانَكَ and اَتَقَدَّمَ أَمَامَكَ may be said, but  
 “ not اَسْكَنَ صَدَّ , etc” (Sn). And عَلَيْكَ زَيْدًا is said  
 [187], meaning *Take Zaid*, orig. اَخَذَكَ عَلَيْهِ ; and إِلَيْكَ  
 اَتَمَّ اَلْقَمَّ اِلَيْكَ وَتَنَحَّ عَنْ عَنِّي , orig. اَتَمَّ اَلْقَمَّ اِلَيْكَ وَتَنَحَّ عَنْ عَنِّي ,  
*Gather thy belongings to thee, and withdraw from me*, and afterwards  
 abridged, as we have mentioned: and Akh heard a man say  
 اَتَنَحَّى اِلَيَّ meaning اَتَنَحَّى اِلَيْكَ *I will withdraw* [187] , which is an  
 anomalous enunciation contrary to the rule of the *cat.*,  
 since the rule of the *adv.*s. and their likes is to be *imps.*,  
 so that عَلَى and دُونِي are not said by analogy to it ;  
 and, as for اُولُنِي عَلَى meaning اُولُنِي عَلَى *Present to me*, it is con-  
 trary to rule in another respect, since it is an *imp.*,  
 but the *pron.* governed in the *gen.* by it is in the sense  
 of the *obj.*, as اُولُنِي عَلَى زَيْدًا meaning *Bring him near to me* \*  
 [187], whereas the rule is that the *gen.* should be an

ag.; and Akh heard <sup>عَلَى</sup> <sup>عَبْدِ</sup> <sup>اللَّهِ</sup> <sup>زَيْدًا</sup> meaning *Bring Zaid near to 'Abd Allāh*, which is more anomalous than <sup>عَلَى</sup>, because <sup>عَلَى</sup> governs the explicit *n.* in the *gen.* And Ks allows *instigation* by all the *adv.* of place and *preps.* regularly; but others restrict it to hearsay, which is the proper way (R). IM says in the CK that there is a dispute about the *pron.* attached to these words, its position being that of (1) a *nom* [as an *ag.* (Sn)], according to Fr ; (2) an *acc.* [as an *obj.* (Sn)], according to Ks, [the *ag.* being latent, as <sup>عَلَيْكَ</sup> <sup>زَيْدًا</sup> meaning <sup>الزِّم</sup> <sup>نَفْسَكَ</sup> <sup>زَيْدًا</sup> *Keep thyself to Zaid* (Sn)]; (3) a *gen.* [by prothesis in such as <sup>دُونَكَ</sup>, and by the *p.* in such as <sup>عَلَيْكَ</sup> (Sn)], according to the BB, which is the correct opinion, because Akh quotes <sup>عَلَى</sup> <sup>عَبْدِ</sup> <sup>اللَّهِ</sup> <sup>زَيْدًا</sup> from chaste-speaking Arabs : [but in the first two opinions what is after the transfer to the *cat.* of verbal *n.* is regarded, and in the last what was before the transfer (Sn)]. And, in addition to that [ك in the position of a *gen.* (Sn)], with every one of these [verbal] *ns.* there is a latent *pron.* in the position of a *nom.* as an *ag.*, so that in corroboration you may say <sup>عَلَيْكُمْ</sup> <sup>كُلَّكُمْ</sup> <sup>زَيْدًا</sup> with the *gen.* as a *corrob.* of the present *gen.*, or the *nom.* as a *corrob.* of the latent *nom.*; [and similarly, when we say that the ك is in the position of an *acc.*, <sup>كُلَّكُمْ</sup> is allowable;

whereas, when we say that it is in the position of a *nom.*, it is itself the *ag.* (Sn)].

§ 200. The ejaculatory *n.* is what is applied to (1) the address of the irrational, or of what is in the predicament of the irrational, such as the young of human beings; (2) the imitation of sounds: so [says IM] in the CK (A). The expressions that the GG name *ejs.* are of three kinds, (1) imitations of sounds proceeding from (a) dumb animals, like غَاقٍ [below]; (b) inanimate substances, alike مَلَقٍ [below]: (2) sounds uttered from the mouths of human beings, and naturally indicative of meanings in their minds, like أَفٌ and تَفٌ; for he that is disgusted at anything utters from his breast a sound [Ugh!] resembling the expression أَفٌ, and from him that spits upon a disgusting thing proceeds a sound resembling تَفٌ: (3) cries wherewith animals are cried to when something is required from them, (a) *coming*, like جَوْتُ; (b) *going*, like هَلَا; (c) *some other matter*, like سَا for *drinking*: but I see nothing to prevent our hazarding the conjecture that these cries, with which the brutes are cried to, are verbal *ns.* i. q. the *imp.*, as some hold; because God has made the brutes like rational beings in understanding what is required from them. The three kinds are named *ejs.* because they are *orig.* simple or disconnected sounds, not words indicative of meanings. Afterwards, being



wanted for use in the middle of the sentence, they are treated like words ; and co-ordinated with the noblest of words, i. e. *ns.*, the better to indicate their inclusion among the apparent kinds of words : so that the Tanwīn is affixed to some of them, as غَاقٍ and أَفٍ [198]; اَلْ is prefixed to some [187], vid. when the *expression*, not the *meaning*, of the *ej.* is intended, as بِاسْمِ الْمَاءِ [123] and كَمَا زَعَمَتِ بِالْجَوْتِ [below]; some are made to mean i. q. *inf.* *ns.*, as أَفٍ لَكَ, i. e. كُرَاهَةً لَكَ ; and some are governed in the *acc.* like *inf. ns.*, as وَاهَا لَكَ, i. e. طَيِّبًا [198]: and what some GG say, vid. that the Tanwīn of غَاقٍ [below] denotes *indeterminateness* [198], is of no account, since *determinateness* and *indeterminateness* have no meaning [187] in it ; nor is there anything to prevent your saying the like of this about such as صَدٌ and اِيَةٌ, because such as صَدٌ is *orig.* an *ej.*; and then we shall be relieved from the difficulty of explaining the Tanwīn in the two preceding ways [187] (R). The ejaculatory *ns.* are [all (IA)] *uninfl.* (R, IA), because they are *orig.* simple sounds not entitled to construction, which is the requirer of inflection [159]; or because some of them are constituted like *ps.*, i. e. of 2 letters, as is said (R); [or] because they resemble the verbal *ns.* (IA). When they occur constructed, they may be *infl.*: Jahm Ibn Al'Abbas says

تُرَدُّ بِحَيْهَلٍ وَعَاجٍ وَإِنَّمَا \* مِنَ الْعَاجِ وَالْحَيْهَلِ جِنٌّ جَنُونُهَا

*She is driven back with "Make haste" and "Get along"; and her madness is only inflamed from the "Get along" and the "Make haste"; and the poet [Dhu-rRumma (AAz)] says تَدَاعَيْنِ الْخ [123]: but another [Uwaif alKawāfi (FA) alFazāri (T)] says*

دَعَاهُنِ رِدْفِي فَارَوَيْنِ اصْوَتَهُ  
كَمَا زَعَمَتْ بِالْجَوْتِ الظَّمَاءُ الصَّوَادِيَا

*[He that rode behind me called them (certain women); and they forbore at his voice, (and returned to him,) as thou urgest with the جَوْتُ the thirsty parched (camels towards the water) (AAz)], by imitation notwithstanding the ا and ل; and you say زَجْرَتُهُ بِهِيَّ or بِهِيَّ I chid him with هَيْيَ [below], as you say in the case of ps. اِنْ لَوْ لَا يَحْدُ الْاَلَهَ [191], and in the case of the uninfl. n. اَللّٰهُ or تَعَالَى بَابِيَّ God (exalted be He!) is not limited by "Where?": and with the ل inflection is more frequent than uninflectedness, as مِنَ الْعَاجِ وَالْحَيْهَلِ with the gen. and بِاسْمِ الشَّيْبِ, because the ل removes the n. from resemblance to the p. [2]; but the ا and ل do not necessitate inflection, as is proved by اَلْآنَ [206] and*

الَّذِي [176]: whereas, when the Tanwīn is affixed to these *ns.*, then, if their *expressions* be intended by them, as in *بَصِيْهٍلٍ وَعَاجٍ*, they must be *infl.*, because it is then the Tanwīn of declinability; but, if it be affixed to them without this intention, as in *غَاقٍ* [above] and *صَعَةٍ*, they are *uninfl.*, because it is the Tanwīn of coordination and correspondence, not the Tanwīn of declinability. Among the *ejs.* that are *imitations of the sounds of human beings, dumb animals, or inanimate substances*, are (1) *طَلِيْغٍ* the *imitation of the sound of the laugher*; (2) *غَاقٍ* or *غَاقٍ* the *croak of the raven*; (3) *شَيْبٍ* the *imitation of the sound of the lips of camels in drinking*; (4) *مَآءٍ* the *cry of the doe-gazelle when she calls her young one*; (5) *طَلَقٍ* and *طَلَقٍ* *imitations of the sound of the fall of stones one upon another*. Among the *ejs. wherewith the brutes are cried to* are (1) *هَلَا* for *chiding horses*, i.e. *Step out*, and sometimes used to chide the *she-chmel* also; (2) *عَدَسٍ* for *chiding the mule*, and sometimes used as a *name for a mule*, both admissible in *عَدَسٍ أَلْعِ* [83], except that the pause upon the *سِ* strengthens the opinion that it is for *chiding*; (3) *هَيْدٍ* with four *dial. vars.*, and *هَادٍ* with *Fath* of the *د* for *chiding camels*; (4) *جَرَتْ* for *calling*

camels to drink ; (5) عَاجَ or عَاجَ for *chiding the she-camel* ; (6) سَا and تَشْوُ for *calling the he-ass to water*. And among the *ejs. indicative of states in the mind of the speaker* are (1) دِي , which denotes *repentance or wonder* [187] : (a) according to Fr, the o. f. of دِيل is دِي ; and the ل is a *prep.*, the o. f. being دِي لَك , i.e. عَجَبًا لَكَ *I wonder at thee !* ; but is afterwards so frequently used [with دِي] as to be compounded with it and become the ل of the *v.*, so that they say وَيَلًا and وَيَل : while others hold وَيَل , وَيِم , وَيَس , and وَيِب to be distinct words meaning *destruction*, and to be *inf. ns.* having no *vs.* [41] : (b) the saying وَيَلَمُهُ [84] is related with (a) Damm of the ل , in which case the o. f. is either (a) وَيَل أُمَّهُ , *The destruction of his mother (is realized) !*, an *inch.* whose *enunc.* is suppressed, i.e. هَلَاكُهَا حَاصِلٌ , meaning *God destroy her !*, as قَاتَلَهُ اللَّهُ *God fight against him !* is said in *wonder*, because the thing, when it reaches its extreme, is cursed as a protection from the fatal eye ; while the Hamza is then irregularly elided [658] for alleviation, since وَيَلَمُهُ becomes like one word importing the meaning of عَجَبًا : or (β) دِي لَامُهُ *I marvel at*

his mother, (*what a child she has borne*) !, i.e. <sup>عَجَبًا لَهَا أَي</sup>  
<sup>وَأَيُّ وَلَدَاتٍ</sup>, the Damma of the Hamza being then irregularly  
transferred to the mobile 'ل', and the Hamza elided for  
alleviation, because the composition mentioned is intend-  
ed : (b) Kasr of the 'ل', in which case its *o. f.* is <sup>وَي</sup> <sup>لَامَةٌ</sup>,  
and the Hamza is then elided with its Damma : (c)  
<sup>وَيَكُن</sup>, as in <sup>يَكُن</sup> <sup>اللَّهُ</sup>, XXVIII. 82. [below], is, ac-  
cording to Khl and S, <sup>وَي</sup> denoting *wonder* compounded  
with <sup>كُن</sup> [denoting *comparison* (B)], uncontracted, as  
in the text, or contracted [525], as in <sup>وَيَكُن</sup> <sup>مِنْ</sup> <sup>أَلَمْ</sup>  
[187] ; but in this saying there is a sort of obscurity in  
the meaning, because the meaning of *comparison* is not  
plain in such as <sup>وَيَكُن</sup> <sup>اللَّهُ</sup> <sup>يَبْسُطُ</sup> <sup>الرِّزْقَ</sup>, XXVIII. 82.  
[above] *I marvel because, or verily* [187], *God enlarg-*  
*eth subsistence*, <sup>وَيَكُنْ</sup> <sup>أَلَمْ</sup> <sup>يَكُنْ</sup> <sup>أَلَمْ</sup> XXVIII. 82. [509], and <sup>وَيَكُنْ</sup>  
[187] : while Fr says that <sup>وَي</sup> is a word of  
*wonder*, which has the ك of allocution affixed to it, as in  
<sup>عَجَبًا مِنْكَ</sup> and <sup>وَيْلَكَ</sup> [187], i. e. <sup>قِيلَ</sup> <sup>أَلْفَوَارِسٍ</sup> <sup>وَيْكَ</sup> <sup>أَلَمْ</sup>  
*I wonder at thee*, and <sup>أَيُّ</sup> added to it ; and that the mean-  
ing of XXVIII. 82. [509] is *Hast thou not seen that the*  
*unthankful etc ?*, as though the person addressed were  
asserting that they did prosper, and the speaker there-

upon said to him *I marvel at thee*, and then, being asked "Wherefore marvellest thou at him?", went on to say that [meaning *because* (K)] *the unthankful prosper not*; so that the *prep.* [ل (K)] is suppressed with <sup>ء</sup>أَنْ and <sup>ء</sup>أَنْ, as is the rule [514]: and he mentions, as evidence of its meaning *Hast thou not seen?*, that, when an Arab woman of the desert asked her husband "Where is thy son?", he said <sup>ء</sup>وَيْكَ أَنْتَ وَرَاءَ الْبَيْتِ meaning *Hast thou not seen that he is behind the tent?*; and that, since the meaning of <sup>ء</sup>وَيْكَ becomes *Hast thou not seen?*, the ك of allocution is not altered for the *fem.*, *du.*, or *pl.*, but keeps to one state: and this that Fr says is more probable as respects the meaning: (2) <sup>ء</sup>أَفْ and <sup>ء</sup>أَوْه, both mentioned among the verbal *ns.* [187, 197]: (3) <sup>ء</sup>بُغْ, a word said upon *admiration* and *pleasure* at the thing; and repeated for intensiveness, as <sup>ء</sup>بُغْ <sup>ء</sup>بُغْ: (a) if it be continuous, the خ may be single or double, being in either case pronounced with Kasr and Tanwin, as says the poet, combining the two,

رَوَّافِدَةٌ أَكْرَمُ الرَّوَّافِدَاتِ \* بُغْ لَكَ بُغْ لِيُبْحَرْ خُضْرٌ

*Its rafters are the most generous of rafters. Bravo to thee! Bravo to a munificent ocean of bounty!*: (b) when explained by the ل, it is used as an *inf. n.*, as

before shown [187]: (4) <sup>كف</sup> and <sup>أخ</sup>, [a word said upon *disgust* (AAz),] which, in the saying of the poet [Al'Ajjāj (AAz)]

لَا خَيْرَ فِي الشَّيْخِ إِذَا مَا جَحَا \* وَسَلَّ غَرْبُ عَيْنِهِ وَلَحَا  
وَأَثْنَتِ الرَّجُلُ فَصَارَتْ فَخَا \* وَصَارَ وَصَلَ الْغَانِيَاتِ أَخَا

[*There is no good in the old man when he lets his water run, and the duct of his eye flows and fills with tears, and the leg bends and becomes curved like a snare, and the union of the blooming maids becomes loathsome* (AAz)], also related <sup>كفا</sup>, is treated like the *inf. n.*, and is therefore *infl.*, being an *inf. n. i. q. the pass. part*, i. e. <sup>مكروها</sup> (R).

## THE UNINFLECTED ADVERBS.

§ 201. Some *advs.* [64] are *uninfl.* [159] (Sh, Jm), not all (Jm) : upon quiescence, like اُنْ [204] ; Fath, like اَلْآنَ [206] ; Kasr, like اَمْسِي [206] ; and Damm, like حَيْثُ [202] (Sh). Among the [*uninfl.* (Jm)] *advs.* is that [*adv.* (Jm)] which is cut off from prothesis [by suppression of the *post.* in letter, not in intention (Jm)], like قَبْلُ and بَعْدُ (IH). The *advs.* heard cut off from prothesis [115], are قَبْلُ, بَعْدُ, تَحْتَ, فَوْقَ, اِمَامَ, قَدَامَ, مِنْ اَعْلَى, مِنْ اَسْفَلِ, مِنْ اَوَّلِ, مِنْ اٰخِرِ, and مِنْ اَمَامِ ; and such as are in their sense, like اَخِرَ, شِمَالِ, يَمِينِ, etc., are not treated analogously to them. The *post.* [*n.* or *prop.*] is suppressed, if the suppressed be represented *post.* to a *n.* in apposition with the 1st *pre.*, as اِلَّا عِلَالَةً اَوْ [128] : whereas, if it be not represented, it is not suppressed, except from what is indicative of a *relative matter*, which is not complete without something else, like قَبْلُ, بَعْدُ, and their sisters mentioned, and كُلُّ, بَعْضُ, and اُنْ ; nor even from this, except when there exists a context to specify that suppressed. These *advs.*, when cut off from the *post.*, are *uninfl.* because of



their resemblance to the *p.* [159] in their need [497] of the sense of that suppressed. As for <sup>أَئِ</sup>حَيْثُ, <sup>أَئِ</sup>أَنْ, and <sup>أَئِ</sup>أَنْ [159], although they are *pre.* to the *props.* present after them, still their prothesis is not apparent, since the prefixion is really to the *inf. ns.* of those *props.*, so that [they are *uninfl.* because] the *post.* is as it were suppressed; and, since the Tanwīn in <sup>بَعْضُ</sup>بَعْضٍ and <sup>كُلُّ</sup>كُلِّ is substituted for the *post.* [128, 608], they are not *uninfl.*, because the *post.* is as it were expressed through the expression of its substitute. In these *advs.* uninflectedness is preferred to compensation, because *advs.* have little or no plasticity [64], and aplasticity is akin to uninflectedness, since the meaning of the latter is *inflectional aplasticity*; but Tanwīn as a compensation for the *post.* is also allowable, though rare, in these *advs.*, which are then *infl.*, as

وَنَحْنُ قَتَلْنَا الْأَزْدَ أَزْدَ شَنْوَةَ \* فَمَا شَرِبُوا بَعْدًا عَلَى لَذَّةِ خُمُرٍ

And we slew the Azd, the Azd of Shanū'a; and after (that) they drank not wine with relish and

فَسَاغَ لِي الشَّرَابُ وَكُنْتُ قَبْلًا \* أَكَادُ أَغْصُ بِالْمَاءِ الْغَرَابِ

[by 'Abd Allāh Ibn Ya'rub, when he had taken his blood-revenge, Then wine became easy for me to swallow; and I was wont before (this) to be nearly choked with sweet water (Jsh)], whence the anomalous reading <sup>مِنْ</sup>قَبْلُ



the reading <sup>أ</sup>مِنْ <sup>ق</sup>بَلِّ <sup>د</sup>مِنْ <sup>ب</sup>عَدِ XXX. 3. and the saying  
 أَخْ [above] (IA) : (2) they are *uninfl.*  
 upon Damm when [they are cut off from prothesis in  
 letter, but not in sense, so that (Sh)] the *post.* is sup-  
 pressed [in letter (Sh)], but its sense is intended to be  
 understood, as in XXX. 3. (IA, Sh) in the reading of  
 the Seven with Damm, where IY [following Z in the M]  
 supplies the ellipse as though the *o. f.* were <sup>أ</sup>مِنْ <sup>ق</sup>بَلِّ <sup>كُلِّ</sup> [128], which sense is true, except that  
<sup>أ</sup>مِنْ <sup>ق</sup>بَلِّ <sup>أ</sup>لْغَلْبِ <sup>وَمِنْ</sup> <sup>ب</sup>عَدِ before (the overcoming) and  
 after (it) would be more appropriate to the context  
 [502] (Sh), and in <sup>أ</sup>قْبِ <sup>مِنْ</sup> <sup>ت</sup>حْتِ <sup>أ</sup>خْ [below] (IA);  
 and similarly in the saying of the Ḥamāsī [Ma'n Ibn  
 Aus (FA, Jsh) alMuzanī (Jsh)]

لَعَمْرُكَ مَا أَدْرِى وَأَنْى لَأَوْجِلُ \* عَاىِ اَيْنَا تَغْدُو الْمَنِىَّةُ اَوَّلُ

[By thy life, I know not—and verily I am much afraid—to  
 which of us fate will go in the early morning at (the) first  
 (of the time or hour) (FA, Jsh)], and the saying of the  
 other ['Utayy Ibn Mālik al 'Uḡailī, cited by Fr (Akh),]

إِذَا اِنَا لَمْ اَوْمِنْ عَلَيْكَ دَلَمْ يَكُنْ \* لِقَاؤُكَ اِلَّا مِنْ وَّرَاىِ وَرَاىِ

(Sh) When I am not reassured about thee, nor is thy  
 meeting save from behind, behind (a curtain) (Jsh).

Mb relates the verse

لَعْنُ الْإِلَاحِ تَعَلَّقَ بِنِ مَسَافِرٍ \* لَعْنًا يَشْنُ عَلَيْهِ مِنْ قَدَامِ

[by a man of the Banù Tamīm, *God curse Ta'illa Ibn Musāfir with a curse that shall be poured upon him from before (Him) !* (FA)] with قَدَامِ, making it *indet.* ;

but Fr relates it with قَدَامِ, making it *det.* (Akh), *orig.* قَدَامِهِ (FA). And F transmits أَبَدًا بِذَا مِنْ

أَوَّلِ with Damm, by uninflectedness, because the *post.* is intended to be understood in sense ; with Fath, by inflection as a diptote [357], because the *post.* is not intended to be understood in letter or sense ; and with Kasr, because the *post.* is intended to be understood in letter (IA). And it is said that these *advs.* [that ought to be] pronounced with Damm may have Tanwīn with [the sign of] the *nom.* and *acc.*, as قَبْلًا and جِئْتُكَ قَبْلَ, like the *voc.* [that ought to be] pronounced with Damm, as يَا مَطَرًا and يَا مَطَرُ [48, 608] ; so that فَمَا شَرِبُوا بَعْدًا [48, 608] ; and وَكُنْتُ قَبْلًا may be instances of this (R). These *advs.*

[cut off from prothesis (R)] are named “finals” (R, Fk), because after the suppression [of the *post.* (YS)] they become finals in articulation after having been medials (Fk). But كُلْ and بَعْضُ, [when cut off from prothesis (R),] are not named “finals”, because the compensation for the *post.* is expressed (R, YS). عَلْ is a *n. i. q.*

فَوْقُ, always used in two ways, (1) governed in the *gen.* by مِنْ and (2) aprothetic [in letter (DM)] ; so that مِنْ فَرْقَةٍ and مِنْ عَلَوَةٍ is not said, as أَخَذْتَهُ مِنْ عِلِّ السَّطَاحِ are said: but many are mistaken in this [2nd matter, saying that it may be *pre.* (DM)]; and among them are Jh and IM: and, as for the saying

يَا رَبِّ يَوْمٍ لِي لَا أَظْلَلُ  
أَرْضٍ مِنْ تَحْتِ وَاضْحَى مِنْ عَلَ

[by Abū Tharwān, *O many a day there is for me wherein I am not shaded, being scorched by the hot sand from beneath (my feet) and exposed to the sun from above (my head)! (Jsh)*], the ڤ is for silence, [not a *post. pron.* (DM),] as is proved by the fact that عَلٌ is *uninfl.* [615]; whereas, if it were *pre.*, there would be no reason for its uninflectedness. When a *det.* [i.e. a *particular thing*, vid. a *specified superiority in position* (DM),] is meant by عَلٌ, it is *uninfl.* upon Damm, by assimilation to the finals, [among which it is sometimes included (DM),] as in this verse, since what is meant is *superiority in position to [the poet] himself*, not *unrestricted superiority in position*, the sense being that *the burning sand affects him from beneath him, and the heat of the sun from above him*; and similarly in the saying of the other [Abn-nNajm al'Ijli (Jsh)] describing a horse

أَقْبَ مِنْ تَحْتِ عَرِيضٍ مِنْ عَلٍ \* مُعَارِدٌ كَرَّةً أَدْبَرَ أَقْبَلَ

[(He is) lean below (his belly), broad above (his back), returning again and again to the charge of "Retreat, advance", though the citation of this verse by IHsh is not free from doubt, because the final of every hemistich in every one of these verses is a ج pronounced with Kasr, and perhaps he was not acquainted with the ode (Jsh)] : and, when an *indet.* is meant by عَلٍ, it is *infl.*, as in the saying [of Imra alKais (EM)]

مَكْرٌ مَفْرٌ مَقْبِلٌ مَدْبِرٌ مُعَا  
كَجَلْمُودٍ صَخْرٍ حَطَا السَّيْلُ مِنْ عَلٍ

[Good at charging, good at fleeing, advancing and retreating together, like a mass of rock that the torrent has brought down from above (EM)], since what is meant is to compare the horse [81] in his swiftness to a mass of rock that has come down from some high place or other, not from any particular height (ML). It has several dial. vars. (IY) : you say (1) جَتَّةٌ مِنْ عَلٍ, [*infl.* (R), defective (IY), like عَم (IY, R) and شَم, as كَجَلْمُودٍ صَخْرٍ (IY, R) and قَاضٍ (IY, R) and قَبَاٌ مِنْ تَحْتِ وَرِيَا مِنْ عَلٍ (above) (IY)] ; (2) مِنْ عَلٍ, [like قَاضٍ (IY, R) and غَازٍ, as

قَبَاٌ مِنْ تَحْتِ وَرِيَا مِنْ عَلٍ

*Lean below, and plump above* (IY)]; (3) <sup>مِنْ مُعَالٍ</sup>,  
[like <sup>مِرَامٍ</sup> (R), as says Dhu-rRumma

وَنُغْضَانِ الرَّحْلِ مِنْ مُعَالٍ

*And the swaying of the camel-saddle above* (IY)]; (4)  
<sup>مِنْ عَلَا</sup>, [abbreviated (IY), like <sup>عَصَا</sup> (IY, R) and <sup>رَحَى</sup>,

as <sup>فَهَى تَنُوشُ الْخ</sup> (507) (IY)]; (5-7) <sup>مِنْ عَلُو</sup> (M, R), as  
says A'shà Bāhila [lamenting AlMuntashir Ibn Wahb  
alBāhili, one of the great runners of the Arabs (Mb),]

أَنِّي أَتَنَنِي لِسَانٌ لَا أَسْرِبُهَا \* مِنْ عَلَا لَا أَعْجَبُ مِنْهَا وَلَا سَخَرُ

*Verily a message has come to me from up-country,*  
*whereby I shall not be gladdened. There is neither*  
*wondering at it, nor scoffing, related with Damm, Fath,*  
*and Kasr (IY, R) of its* <sup>و</sup> (R); (8) <sup>مِنْ عَلٍ</sup>, as

وَلَقَدْ سَدَدْتُ عَلَيْكَ كُلَّ ثَنِيَّةٍ \* وَاتَّيْتُ فَوْقَ بَنِي كَلَيْبٍ مِنْ عَلٍ

[by AlFarazdaq satirizing Jarīr, *And assuredly I did*  
*stop against thee every mountain-road, and come down*  
*upon the Banū Kulaib from above (them)* (FA, Jsh)];  
and these *dial. vars.* have one meaning, vid. <sup>فَوْقَ</sup> (IY).

When you make <sup>عَلٍ</sup> *uninfl.* upon Damm, the <sup>ل</sup>, i. e.  
the <sup>ي</sup>, must be elided, and clean forgotten, since, if you  
said <sup>عَلِي</sup>, the Damma upon the <sup>ي</sup> would be deemed

heavy; and, if you elided the Damma, and said <sup>ا</sup>عَلَى, its being *uninfl.* upon Damm would not be plain: and, when you intend to make <sup>ا</sup>عَلَوْ *uninfl.*, its <sup>ن</sup>ف must be pronounced with Fath; whereas with inflection it may be pronounced with Damm or Kasr, as <sup>ا</sup>عَلَوْ <sup>ا</sup>الدَّارِ *At the top of the house*, like <sup>ا</sup>سَفَلَهَا *At its bottom*. As for <sup>ا</sup>عَلَوْ, it may be *uninfl.* upon Fath, contrary to the rest of the finals, because of the heaviness of the و pronounced with Damm: and the Kasr, as <sup>ا</sup>مِنْ <sup>ا</sup>عَلَوْ, is either because [it is *infl.*, and] the *post.* is supplied, as in <sup>ا</sup>لَيْسَ <sup>ا</sup>غَيْرِ with Fath [below], in which case this Kasr is found only with a *prep.* before it or with prefixion to the <sup>ا</sup>ي of the *pron.* [129]; or because it is *uninfl.* upon Kasr on account of the Damma's being deemed heavy: while the Damm, as <sup>ا</sup>مِنْ <sup>ا</sup>عَلَوْ, is according to the analogy of the rest of the finals. The finals are *uninfl.* upon a vowel in order that they may be known to be radically *infl.* [159]: and upon Damm in order that they may be reinvigorated with the strongest of the vowels because of the weakness that overtakes them through the suppression of the needed *post.*; or in order that all the vowels may be completed for them, because in the state of inflection, being mostly aplastic, they are governed either in the *gen.* by <sup>ا</sup>مِنْ or in the *acc.* as *adv.* [64]; or in order that



their uninflectional may be different from their inflectional vowel (R). And <sup>لَا</sup> <sup>غَيْرَ</sup> or <sup>لَيْسَ</sup> <sup>غَيْرَ</sup> and <sup>حَسْبُ</sup> are treated in the same way (IH) as the *adv.* cut off from prothesis (Jm). <sup>غَيْرَ</sup> [90] is a *n.* inseparable from prothesis (ML, A) in sense [115]; but may be cut off from it in letter, if the sense of the *post.* be understood, and <sup>غَيْرَ</sup> be preceded by the word <sup>لَيْسَ</sup> [96], the saying <sup>لَا</sup> <sup>غَيْرَ</sup> [below] being a solecism. [There are six constructions with it (DM):] one says (1-2) <sup>قَبَضْتُ عَشْرَةً</sup> <sup>لَيْسَ غَيْرَهَا</sup> *I have received ten, not another than they is (received), or it, i. e. the received, is not another than they,* with <sup>غَيْرَ</sup> in (a) the *nom.*, by suppression of the *pred.*, i. e. <sup>مَقْبُوضًا</sup>; (b) the *acc.*, by subaudition [i. e. latency (DM)] of the *sub.* [in <sup>لَيْسَ</sup> (DM)], i. e. <sup>لَيْسَ الْمَقْبُوضُ غَيْرَهَا</sup> (3): <sup>لَيْسَ غَيْرَ</sup> [above] *it, i. e. the received, is not another (than they),* also by subaudition of the *sub.*, and by suppression of the *post.* in letter, but expression of it in intention, [in which case <sup>غَيْرَ</sup> is *infl.* (DM),] like the reading [of {‘Āsim (MAd)} alJaḥḍarī and {‘Aun (IY)} al‘Uḳailī (IY, Sh)] <sup>مِنْ قَبْلِ الْغَلَبِ</sup> XXX. 3., i. e. <sup>مِنْ قَبْلِ رَمْنٍ بَعْدَ</sup> [above]: (4) <sup>لَيْسَ غَيْرَ</sup> *not another (than they) is (received), or it, i. e. the received, is not another (than they),* in which case (a) Mb and the moderns say that

the Damma is a Damma of uninflectedness, [because the *post.* is suppressed, and its sense, not its letter, is intended to be understood (DM),] not of inflection, and that <sup>٩٨٧</sup>غَيْر is assimilated to the finals, like <sup>٩٨٧</sup>قَبْل and <sup>٩٨٧</sup>بَعْد ; and, according to this, it may be [in the place of a *nom.* as (DM)] *sub.*, or [of an *acc.* as (DM)] *pred.* [of <sup>٩٨٧</sup>لَيْسَ (DM)]: (b) Akh says that it is a Damma of inflection, [the absence of Tanwīn being because the letter of the *post.* is intended to be understood (DM),] not of uninflectedness, because <sup>٩٨٧</sup>غَيْر is not a *n.* of *time*, like <sup>٩٨٧</sup>قَبْل and <sup>٩٨٧</sup>بَعْد , nor of *place*, like <sup>٩٨٧</sup>فَوْق and <sup>٩٨٧</sup>تَحْتَ , but is only like <sup>٩٨٧</sup>كُل and <sup>٩٨٧</sup>بَعْض ; and, according to this, it is [in the *nom.* as (DM)] the *sub.*, the *pred.* being suppressed: (c) IKh says that it admits of both alternatives, [uninflectedness and inflection (DM)]: (5) <sup>٩٨٧</sup>لَيْسَ <sup>٩٨٧</sup>غَيْرَا *it, i. e. the received, is not another* and (6) <sup>٩٨٧</sup>لَيْسَ <sup>٩٨٧</sup>غَيْر *not another is (received)*, in both of which the vowel is inflectional, because the Tanwīn denotes either *complete declension* [608], in which case it is affixed only to *infl. ns.*; or *compensation*, in which case the *post.* is as it were mentioned (ML): here nothing at all [belonging to the *post.*] is intended to be understood ; but with the *acc.* the *sub.* is understood <sup>٩٨٧</sup>لَيْسَ , and with the *nom.* the *pred.* is suppressed (DM). As for the saying <sup>٩٨٧</sup>لَا <sup>٩٨٧</sup>غَيْر [above], which occurs in the phrases of the learned, it

was not spoken by the Arabs ; so that the learned say <sup>لَا</sup> either by analogy to <sup>لَيْسَ</sup>, or by inadvertence (Sh). Apparently, however, there is no difference between the <sup>غَيْرُ</sup> negated by <sup>لَيْسَ</sup> and the one negated by <sup>لَا</sup>, as is shown in the M by Z, and in the Kāfiya by IH, who is followed in that by his commentators, and, among them, the critical judges, [like R (DM)]; and <sup>غَيْرُ</sup> has been heard to occur after <sup>لَا</sup>, for IM cites in the CT

جَوَابًا بِهٖ تَنْجُوْا اَعْتَمِدْ فَوْرَبِنَا • لَعَنَ عَمَلٍ اَسْلَفَتْ لَا غَيْرُ تَسَال

*Rely thou upon an answer whereby thou shalt escape ; for, by our Lord, thou wilt be asked about a deed that thou hast done before, not another : so that what occurs in the ML and Sh is not to be regarded (Fk).* <sup>غَيْرُ</sup> is assimilated to the final *adv.* because of the extreme vagueness in it [114], as in the finals, on account of their being unconfined relative locations [64] : but the *post.* is not suppressed from it except with the <sup>لَا</sup> of exemption and <sup>لَيْسَ</sup>, as <sup>لَا غَيْرُ</sup> اَفْعَلْ هٰذَا <sup>لَيْسَ</sup> I will do this, nothing else and <sup>لَا</sup> جَاؤَنِيْ زَيْدٌ <sup>لَيْسَ غَيْرُ</sup> Zaid came to me, no one else, from the frequent use of <sup>غَيْرُ</sup> after <sup>لَا</sup> and <sup>لَيْسَ</sup> ; and <sup>غَيْرُ</sup> after <sup>لَيْسَ</sup> is i. q. <sup>لَا</sup> [90], the *post.* suppressed in <sup>لَيْسَ</sup> جَاؤَنِيْ زَيْدٌ <sup>لَيْسَ</sup> <sup>لَا</sup> being the excepted suppressed in <sup>لَا</sup> <sup>لَيْسَ</sup> <sup>لَا</sup> <sup>غَيْرُ</sup>

*Zaid has come to me: he, etc.* [96] (R). <sup>حَسْبُ</sup> is i. q. [the pre. n. in] <sup>كَافِيكَ</sup>, an *act. part.* [24, 68] whereby the present is meant, so that [from regard to its being i. q. <sup>كَاف</sup> (Sn)] it is used as an *indet. ep.*, being an *ep.* of an *indet.*, as <sup>مَرَرْتُ بِرَجُلٍ حَسْبِكَ مِنْ رَجُلٍ</sup> [143]; and a *d. s.*

to a *det.*, as <sup>هَذَا عَبْدُ اللَّهِ حَسْبِكَ مِنْ رَجُلٍ</sup> This is 'Abd Allāh, sufficing thee as a man. And [from regard to its *prim. expression* (Sn)] it is also used as a *prim. substantive*, [occurring as an *inch.* or *enunc.*, at present or before the prefixion of the annuller (Sn),] as <sup>حَسْبُهُمْ</sup> LVIII. 9. [*Their sufficiency is Hell, or Hell is their sufficiency* (Sn)], <sup>فَإِنَّ حَسْبَكَ اللَّهُ</sup> VIII. 64. *Verily thy sufficiency is God*, [like the saying of Jarīr

<sup>إِنِّي وَجَدْتُ مِنَ الْكَارِمِ حَسْبَكُمْ \* أَنْ تَلْبَسُوا حَرَّ الثِّيَابِ وَتَشَبِعُوا</sup>

(K, B) *Verily I have found your sufficiency of noble deeds to be this, that you should wear the best of clothes, and be full of meat* (N),] and <sup>بِحَسْبِكَ دِرْهَمٌ</sup> [*Thy sufficiency is a dirham* (Sn)]. And this is an objection to its being a verbal *n.* [68], since the *lit. ops.* are not prefixed to verbal *ns.* [by common consent; and similarly the *id. ops.*, like inchoation, according to the correctest doctrine (Sn)]. It is also cut off from prothesis, in which case

it undergoes two innovations, being (1) imbued with a sense indicative of *negation* ; and (2) always used (a) as an *ep.*, *d. s.*, or *inch.*, and (b) *uninfl.* upon Damm : you say [in the case of the *ep.*, or *d. s.*] رَأَيْتُ رَجُلًا حَسْبَ I saw a man, or Zaid, sufficing (me or thee), as though, says Jh, you said حَسْبِي or حَسْبُكَ ; and in the case of the *inch.* قَبِضْتُ عَشْرَةَ فَحَسْبُ I received ten ; and (my) sufficiency (was that), i. e. فَحَسْبِي ذَلِكُ (A). What is *post.* to حَسْبُ may be [thus] suppressed from frequency of usage ; and it is *uninfl.* upon Damm by assimilation to غَيْرٌ, since, like the latter [114], it does not become *det.* by prothesis. The *adv. pre.* to *props.* are of two kinds, (1) necessarily *pre.* to them by application [115], which are three in number, حَيْثُ in place, and أَذْ and إِذْ in time : (a) there is a dispute [204] as to whether the [*cond.*] *prop.* immediately following أَذْ governs إِذْ or not ; and, if it does, إِذْ is not *pre.* to it ; but, if it does not, إِذْ is *pre.* to it : (b) حَيْثُ and أَذْ are *pre.* to the verbal and nominal [*props.*] ; but there is a dispute [204] as to whether إِذْ may be *pre.* to the nominal : (2) allowably *pre.* to the *prop.*, which are only *ns.* of time *pre.* to a *prop.* from which one of



this is when the *n.* of *time* is *pre.* to a *prop.* of whose *inf. n.* it is the *adv.* in sense, as you see : whereas, if the *n.* of *time* be not an *adv.* to the *inf. n.*, but be either *before* or *after* the latter, it has not with the *prop.* that peculiarity which the *adv.* of the *inf. n.* of the *prop.* has ; and therefore it is not used except with an infinitival *p.*, like <sup>اَن</sup> , <sup>اَن</sup> , <sup>اَن</sup> , and <sup>مَا</sup> , before the *prop.*, as <sup>مِنْ قَبْلِ اَن</sup> IV. 50. *Before that We deform faces* and IX. 118. [460]. As for <sup>رَيْث</sup> , [which is not a *n.* of *time*,] it is *pre.* to the verbal *prop.* [124], as <sup>تَوَقَّفْ رَيْثَ اَخْرَجَ اِلَيْكَ</sup> *Wait until I come out to thee*, because it is an *inf. n.* meaning *delay*, made to act as a substitute for the *pre. n.* of *time* [65], the *o. f.* being <sup>زَمَانٌ رَيْثَ</sup> *during the time of the delay of my coming out*, i. e. *during the period that my coming out delays, until it enters into existence*, meaning *until I come out* ; and similarly <sup>اَيَّةٌ</sup> i. q. <sup>اَيَّةٌ</sup> *may be pre. to the verbal prop.* because of its resemblance to <sup>وَقْتُ</sup> , since *times* are *signs* whereby events are timed and acts specified : but, since the sense of *time* is adventitious in <sup>رَيْثَ</sup> and <sup>اَيَّةٌ</sup> , they are mostly *pre.* to the verbal *prop.* headed by an infinitival *p.*, as the poet says <sup>بَايَةَ يَقْدُمُونَ</sup> and <sup>بَايَةَ مَا تُحِبُّونَ</sup> [124, 571], and you say <sup>اقْمِ رَيْثَمَا اَخْرَجَ</sup> *Bide until I come*

out ; and, since, according to the KK [below], the *n.* of time itself is *pre.* to the verbal [*prop*] with an infinitival *p.*, how much more is what resembles it ! And ذُرْ also, when *infl* as in ذُرْ مَالٍ [16], is *pre.* to the verbal [*prop.*] in their sayings اِذْهَبْ بِذِي تَسْلَمٍ [124], اِذْهَبْ بِذِي تَسْلَمَانَ, and اِذْهَبُوا بِذِي تَسْلَمُونَ : some say that this [prefixion] is anomalous, [because ذُرْ is not a *n.* of time,] ذِي being *ep.* of الأَمْرِ, i. e. مَعَ الأَمْرِ ذِي السَّلَامَةِ with the (matter) possessed of safety, meaning مَعَ الأَمْرِ الَّذِي تَسْلَمُ فِيهِ with the matter wherein thou shalt be safe, the ب being i. q. مَعَ ; but Sf says that the *n.* qualified by ذِي [142] is فِي الْوَقْتِ ذِي السَّلَامَةِ, i. e. فِي الْوَقْتِ الَّذِي تَسْلَمُ فِيهِ in the (time) possessed of safety, meaning فِي الْوَقْتِ الَّذِي تَسْلَمُ فِيهِ in a time wherein thou shalt be safe, the ب being i. q. فِي, in which case the prefixion is not anomalous, because ذُرْ is like a *n.* of time *pre.* to the *v.* ; while some say that it is the Tā'ī ذُرْ *infl.*, which is improbable, because the Tā'ī ذُرْ in the best known *dial.* has the و in all cases [176]. And sometimes ذُرْ in prefixion to the *v.* is used in the same way as in prefixion to the *n.*, as جَاءَنِي ذُرْ فَعَلٌ He that did came to me and ذُرُوا فَعَلًا and ذُرُوا فَعَلُوا and



ذَوَاتُ فَعَلْنَ and ذَوَاتَا فَعَلْنَا and ذَاتُ فَعَلَتْ, being then either Tā'ī, according to the *dial.* transmitted by IDn [176] ; or i. q. <sup>9</sup>مَاجِبْ anomalously *pre.* to the *v.* S says that, when one of the two terms of the *prop.* immediately following <sup>9</sup>حَيْثُ and <sup>9</sup>إِذَا is a *v.*, it is better to put that *v.* first, because these two <sup>9</sup>*adv.* contain the sense of *condition*, which is more appropriate to the *v.*, so that <sup>9</sup>حَيْثُ زَيْدٌ يَجْلِسُ is better than <sup>9</sup>زَيْدٌ يَجْلِسُ <sup>9</sup>حَيْثُ : but what he says here about <sup>9</sup>إِذَا requires consideration, from the frequency of such [phrases] as LXXXIV. 1. [23, 204] and LXXXII. 1. <sup>9</sup>إِذَا السَّمَاءُ انْفَطَرَتْ <sup>9</sup>وَإِذَا الْكَوَاكِبُ انْتَثَرَتْ 2. *When the heaven shall be cloven in sunder, and when the stars shall be scattered.* <sup>9</sup>مِثْلُ and <sup>9</sup>غَيْرُ are sometimes assimilated to the *adv.* necessarily *pre.* to *props.*, i. e. <sup>9</sup>حَيْثُ, <sup>9</sup>إِذَا, and <sup>9</sup>إِذَا, because they are vague, like those *adv.* : but, since they are only remotely assimilated to those *adv.*, they are not *pre.* to the pure *prop.* in the same way as those *adv.* are, but to a *prop.* headed by an infinitival *p.*, as LI. 23. [518], <sup>9</sup>لَمْ يَمْنَعْ الشَّرْبَ الْخَ [90], and <sup>9</sup>غَيْرُ أَنْفَى قَدْ الْخَ [90] ; because the affinity between the *pre. n.* of *time* and the *post. prop.* in their indicating *time*, and the fact that the *n.* of *time* is an *adv.* to the *inf. n.* of the *post. prop.*, enable the infinitival *p.* to be

dispensed with in the case of the *n.* of *time*, but are not found in <sup>٩٨</sup>مِثْل and <sup>٩٨</sup>غَيْر, so that the infinitival *p.* is needed in their case. The KK [above], however, transmit from the Arabs that the *adv.* also are *pre.* to <sup>٢٤</sup>أَنْ and <sup>٨٤</sup>أَنْ, as <sup>٩</sup>يَوْمَ <sup>٨٤</sup>أَنْ يَقُومَ <sup>٩٨</sup>زَيْدٌ and <sup>٩</sup>يَوْمَ <sup>٨٤</sup>أَنْكَ <sup>٩٨</sup>مُحْسِنٌ; and, if this were right, those *adv.* might be *infl.* and *uninfl.*, like <sup>٩٨</sup>مِثْل and <sup>٩٨</sup>غَيْرِ <sup>٢٤</sup>أَنْ نَطَلَقَتْ LI. 23. [518,159] and <sup>٩٨</sup>غَيْرِ in <sup>٨٤</sup>مَا <sup>٩٨</sup>أَنْكَمَ LI. 23. [518,159]. The author of the Mughnī says that, the *adv.* *pre.* to *props.* being *det.*, it is correct to say <sup>٩٨</sup>حَتَّى يَوْمَ but, besides the strangeness of this usage and the fact that it has not been heard, the *pre.* ought not to be *det.* when the *ag.* in the verbal or *inch.* in the nominal [*prop.*] is *indet.*, as <sup>٩</sup>يَوْمَ <sup>٩٨</sup>قَدِمَ <sup>٩٨</sup>أَمِيرٌ and <sup>٩</sup>يَوْمَ <sup>٩٨</sup>قَدِمَ <sup>٩٨</sup>أَمِيرٌ <sup>٩٨</sup>كَرِيمٌ, since the sense is <sup>٩٨</sup>يَوْمَ <sup>٩٨</sup>قَدِمَ <sup>٩٨</sup>أَمِيرٌ [111]. The *n.* of *time* or <sup>٩٨</sup>حَيْث, even if it be not an *adv.*, is *pre.* to the *prop.* [124], as LXXVII. 35. [159], V. 119 [1], VI. 124. [64], and

يَا ذُلَّ حَيْثُ يَكُونُ مَنْ يَتَذَلُّ

O the lowliness of the place where he that is lowly is!, [where <sup>٢٤</sup>ذُل is *pre.* to <sup>٩٨</sup>حَيْث (J)]. As for such as <sup>٩٨</sup>يَوْمَئِذٍ [204], <sup>٩٨</sup>حَيْثُئِذٍ, and <sup>٩٨</sup>سَاعَتَيْنِ, the *adv.* are said to be

pre. to اِنْ pre. in sense to a suppressed prop. that the Tanwīn is substituted for [128, 608]: but that [explanation] involves obscurity as respects the sense, since كَذَا and حِينَ وَقْتُ and the like are strange in usage, corrupt in sense, contrary to such as اِنْ اَنْتُمْ بعد اِنْ اَنْتُمْ III. 74. After ye have been Muslims, since its sense is after that time, while in اَلْيَوْمِ اَلْوَقْتُ الْمَعْلُومِ XV. 38. Until the day of the known promise اَلْوَقْتُ, says F, is i. q. اَلْوَعْدِ; and it seems to me that these advs., which are as it were apparently pre. to اِنْ, are [really] pre. not to it, but to the suppressed props., [like the adv. in اِنْ,] except that, when these props. are suppressed because indicated by the drift of the sentence, it is not good that a Tanwīn should be substituted for them affixed to these advs., as it is substituted in كُلِّ, بَعْضٍ, and اِنْ [128]. For, كُلِّ and its sisters being inseparable from prothesis in sense [115], the suppression of the post. is inferred from the sense; and, that suppressed being specified by the circumstantial evidence obtained from the drift of the sentence, what is meant becomes complete, as in XXI. 79. [128], XLIII. 31. [128], and نَهَيْتُكَ عَنْ اَلْعَمَلِ [204]: whereas, these advs. not being inseparable from prothesis in sense, if you said جَاوَبَنِي زَيْدٌ وَكَنتَ حِينَئِذَا, intending

to suppress the *post.* and substitute the Tanwīn of حِينًا for it, i. e. حِينٌ ذَاكَ at the time (of that), حِينًا would not appear to be used in that sense, but the Tanwīn in it would appear to denote [*declinability* and] *indeterminateness*; [for I see nothing to prevent one Tanwīn from denoting *declinability* and *indeterminateness* together, since many a *p.* imports two meanings, so that the Tanwīn in حِينٌ imports *indeterminateness* also, but, when you use the *n.* as a name, denotes *pure declinability* (R on the Tanwīn)]. Since, then, they fear that the Tanwīn of *compensation* in يَوْمًا, حِينًا, and سَاعَةً should be confounded with the Tanwīn of *declinability* and *indeterminateness*, they effect the indication of the suppressed *props. orig. post.* to those *advs.* by putting as a total *subst.* for those *advs.* an *adv.* [أَنَّ] inseparable from prefixion to *props.*, light in expression, applicable to all sorts of *ns.* of time, سَاعَةً, حِينٌ, يَوْمٌ, لَيْلَةً, etc, and accustomed to suppression of the *props. post.* to it, together with substitution of Tanwīn for them, as in وَأَنْتَ إِنْ صَحِیحٌ [204]. Thus أَنَّ is put after those *advs.* as a [total] *subst.* for them, together with the Tanwīn of *compensation*, in order that the Tanwīn may be as it were existent in the *ant. advs.*, because the total *subst.* [150], being not only ideally put into the place of the *ant.* [151], but unre-

strictedly applicable to what the *ant.* is applicable to, is as it were the *ant.*; and اِنْ is pronounced with Kasr of the ا because of the concurrence of the two quiescents [608], this vowel [664] being necessary in order that اِنْ may be like a *decl. n.* governed in the *gen., post.* to the 1st *adv.*, so that the suppression of the *post.* from the 1st *adv.* without uninflectedness upon Damm or the Tanwīn of *compensation* may not be disapproved; and, since the object mentioned is effected by means of اِنْ, and the *advs.* mentioned are *future* and *past*, اِنْ is divested of the sense of the *past*, and becomes denotative of *unrestricted adverbiality*, so that it may be used in the *future* [204] also, as قَوْلٌ بَوْمَتْنِ لِلْمُكَذِّبِينَ LII. 11. *Then woe on that day to them that treat the signs of God as false* and the like. But the truth is that اِنْ, when the *post.* is suppressed, and the Tanwīn substituted for it, otherwise than in such as يَوْمَتْنِ, may be pronounced with Fath also, whence فَعَلْنَاهَا اِذَا وَاَنَا مِنَ الضَّالِّينَ XXVI. 19. *I did it then, when I was one of the erring, i. e. I did it when thou hadst brought me up, since requital* [594] has no meaning here. The *adv. pre.* to the *prop.* being an *adv.* to the *inf. n.* implied by the *prop.*, as we stated before, a *pron.* may not relate to it from the *prop.* [124], so that اَتَيْتَكَ يَوْمَ قَدِمْتُ زَيْدٌ فِيهِ is not said, because, the

connection sought to be realised from such a *pron.* is realised by prefixing the *adv.* to the *prop.*, and making it an *adv.* to the purport thereof, so that it is as though you said <sup>يَوْمَ قُدُومِ زَيْدٍ فِيهِ</sup> , i. e. <sup>فِي الْيَوْمِ</sup> , which is not used; and the *cop.* is necessary only when the *adv.* is not connected by reason of its being pronounced with Tanwin, as <sup>يَوْمًا قَدِمَ فِيهِ زَيْدٌ</sup> *On a day that Zaid arrived on* : the Kūr says <sup>يَوْمَ تَبْيَضُ وَتَسْوَدُ وَجُوهٌ</sup> III. 102. *On the day when faces shall become white and faces shall become black* ; but sometimes <sup>يَوْمَ تَسْوَدُ فِيهِ</sup> and the like are said, which is anomalous. The *adv.*s. necessarily *pre.* to *props.* must be *uninfl.* [159], because they are *pre.* in sense to the *inf. n.* implied by the *prop.* , so that their prefixion to the *prop.* is like no prefixion, and therefore they resemble the finals [202] (R). The [*sing.* and *pl.*, but not the *du.*, of the (R)] *adv.*s. [allowably (R)] *pre.* to the *prop.* or [to the word (Jm)] <sup>أَنَّ</sup> may be *uninfl.*, [(a) by common consent, when the *prop.* is headed by a *pret.*; (b) according to the KK and some of the BB, when it is headed by an *eor.* or is nominal, whether the head of the latter be *infl.* or *uninfl.* in letter, as in <sup>جِئْتُكَ يَوْمَ أَنْتَ أَمِيرٌ</sup> *I came to thee on the day when thou wast governor*, since it must be *infl.* in place ; and (c) by common consent in such as <sup>عَيْنُكَ</sup> (R),] upon Fath [for the sake of

lightness (Jm)] : and similarly <sup>٩٨</sup>مِثْل and <sup>٩٨</sup>غَيْر, [i. e. <sup>٩٨</sup>مِثْل (R)] with <sup>٩٨</sup>مَا, and [ <sup>٩٨</sup>غَيْر with (R)] <sup>٨٤</sup>أَنْ or <sup>٨٤</sup>أَنْ (IH), may be *uninfl.* [90, 111, 159] (R, Jm), by common consent (R), upon Fath (Jm).

§ 202. <sup>٩٨</sup>حَيْث or [in the *dial.* of Tayyi (ML)] <sup>٩٨</sup>حَوْث, is [*uninfl.* (R, DM),] pronounced in both *dials.* with (1) Damm of the ث [according to the best known usage (R)], by assimilation to the finals [201], because [its (R)] prefixion [to the *prop.* (ML)] is like no prefixion, [since its effect, vid. the sign of the *gen.* {in the *post.* (DM)}, is not apparent (ML)]; (2) Kasr, [according to the *o. f.* in the concurrence of two quiescents (ML)]; (3) Fath [for alleviation (ML)]: and <sup>٩٨</sup>حَيْث is *infl.* (R, ML) by some of the Arabs (ML), which is a Fak'asī *dial.* (R, DM); while the reading <sup>٩٨</sup>مِنْ حَيْثُ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ VII. 181. [So that they shall not know (what We mean to do with them) (B)] may be an instance of this [*infl.* (DM) *dial. var.* or of the *dial. var. uninfl.* upon Kasr. It denotes *place*, by common consent (ML): and Akh says that it sometimes denotes *time* (T, R, ML), as

لَفَتَى عَقْلٌ يَعْيشُ بِهِ \* حَيْثُ تَهْدِي سَاقَهُ قَدَمُهُ

[by Tarafa (Ahl),] *The youth has understanding where-  
by he lives while his foot guides his shank* (T, R, DM),  
because the sense is *during the period of his toil and his*

*life* (T); but here also it may denote *place* (R, DM). It is mostly [in the place of an *acc.* as (ML)] an *adv.* (R, ML), as <sup>فَاَقْتُلُوا الْمُشْرِكِينَ حَيْثُ وَجَدْتُمُوهُمْ</sup> IX. 5. *Slay ye the unbelievers wherever ye find them* (DM); or of a *gen.* governed by <sup>مِنْ</sup> (ML), as <sup>وَمِنْ حَيْثُ خَرَجْتَ</sup> II. 114. (DM) *And from whatever place thou comest forth (to journey), turn thy face in the direction of the sacred mosque (when thou prayest)* (B): but not always (R), being sometimes governed in the [place of a (DM)] *gen.* by something else (ML) than <sup>مِنْ</sup> (DM), as

فَشَدَّ دَأْمَ يَفْزَعُ بِيَوْتًا كَثِيرَةً  
لَدَى حَيْثُ الْقَتْلِ رَحَلَهَا أَمْ قَشَعُمُ

[by Zuhair, *Then he attacked (him); and scared not (the people of) many tents, at the place where Pate (8) had thrown down her camel-saddle, i. e. at her abode* (EM)]; and [sometimes a direct *obj.*, agreeably with the opinion of F, who attributes to it (ML)] VI. 124. [64, 201] (R, ML), since the sense is that *God knoweth [360] the place itself that is meet for the bestowal of the Apostolate therein, not something in the place* (ML), and similarly <sup>أَمَّا تَرَى حَيْثُ هَيْلِ الْخِ</sup> [below], where it is the [direct (AAz)] *obj.* of <sup>تَرَى</sup>; while <sup>هِيَ أَحْسَنُ النَّاسِ حَيْثُ نَظَرُ</sup>



نَاطِرٌ She is the most beautiful of mankind in a place where a looker looks has been transmitted, meaning وَجْهًا in face, where it is a *sp.* (R). It does not occur as *sub.* of اِنْ, contrary to the opinion of IM; nor has he any evidence in the saying

اِنْ حَيْثُ اسْتَقَرَّ مِنْ اَنْتَ رَاعِيَةٌ \* حِمَى فَيْدٍ عِزَّةً وَاَمَانًا  
[Verily the place, where he that thou art the protector of resides, is a sanctuary wherein are honor and safety (DM)], because حَيْثُ may be construed to be a *pred.*, and حِمَى a *sub.*, [i. e. Verily a sanctuary etc. is (in the place) where etc. (DM)]. حَيْثُ is always *pre.* to the *prop.*, nominal or verbal; but more often to the verbal, for which reason the *acc.* is preferable in such as جَلَسْتُ زَيْدًا اَرَاةً I sat where (I see) Zaid, I see him [62] (ML). Its prefixion to the single term is extraordinary, as

نَضَاعَنَهُمْ تَحْتَ الْكَلَى بَعْدَ ضَرْبِهِمْ  
بِبَيْضِ الْمَوَاضِي حَيْثُ لِي الْعَمَائِمُ

(R, ML), said to be by AlFarazdak, And we pierce them below the kidneys after smiting them with the sharp swords at the place of the fold of the turbans, where حَيْثُ is in the position of an *acc.* as an *adv.* (SM), and

أَمَا تَرَى حَيْثُ سَهِيلٌ طَالِعًا  
نَجْمًا يَضِيءُ كَالشَّهَابِ لَامِعًا

[above] (R) *Seest thou not the place of Canopus when rising? (I mean by Canopus) a star that shines like the flame, gleaming (J): but Ks holds it to be regular; and thus can be explained the saying of the Lawyers* مِّنْ حَيْثُ أَنْ كَذَا Whereas such and such, [with Fath of the Hamza of أَنْ (518) (DM)]. And more extraordinary than that is its prefixion to a suppressed *prop.*, as

إِذَا رِيْدَةٌ مِّنْ حَيْثُ مَا نَفَعَتْ لَهُ \* أَتَا بِرِيْهَا خَلِيلٌ يُّوْاصِلُهُ

[by Abū Hayya anNumairi, *When a breeze from wherever (it blows) is wafted to him (the he-ass), a nose that is attached to him brings to him its (the meadow's) fragrance (Jsh)*], i. e. مِّنْ حَيْثُ هَبَّتْ (ML), the *prop.* being suppressed, and مَا put as a compensation for it (DM).

حَيْثُ when *pre.* to the single term, is *infl.* (R, ML) by some (R), according to IJ (ML), which is said to be the *dial.* of Hudhail (AAz), because the cause of uninflectedness, i. e. prefixion to the *prop.*, is removed (R); and I have seen, in the handwriting of orthographers

أَمَا تَرَى حَيْثُ سَهِيلٌ طَالِعًا

[above], with Fath of the ث (ML): but in the best known usage it remains *uninfl.*, because prefixion to the single term is anomalous (R). <sup>حَيْثُ</sup>, when the res-  
tringent <sup>مَا</sup> is attached to it [181, 565], implies the sense of *condition*, and apocopates two *vs.*, as <sup>حَيْثُمَا تَسْتَقِمُ الْخُ</sup>  
[419]; and this verse is, according to me, a proof of its denoting *time* (ML), i. e. *In whatever time*, not *In whatever place, thou art straight*, as is proved by <sup>فِي غَايِرِ</sup>  
<sup>الْأَزْمَانِ</sup> (DM).

§ 203. <sup>مِنْ</sup> and <sup>مِنْذُ</sup> [both pronounced with Kasr of their م in one *dial.* (Sn)] are used [by the Arabs (IY)] as *ns.* and *ps.* [498] (IY, A), <sup>مِنْذُ</sup> mostly as a *p.*, and <sup>مِنْ</sup> mostly as a *n.* [510]. They are peculiar to *time*, being prefixed only to a [*n.* of] *time*; and their relation to *time* is the same as that of <sup>مِنْ</sup> to *place*, <sup>مِنْ</sup> denoting *beginning of extent in place* [499], and <sup>مِنْذُ</sup> and <sup>مِنْذُ</sup> in *time* [510] (IY). When they are *ns.*, they have two meanings, (1) *the beginning of the period*, [with which only *definite time* is allowable (IY),] as <sup>مَا رَأَيْتُهُ مِنْذُ يَوْمِ الْجُمُعَةِ</sup> *I have not seen him since Friday*: (2) *the whole of the period*, [to which the *indet.* is peculiar (IY),] as <sup>مَا رَأَيْتُهُ مِنْذُ يَوْمَانِ</sup> *I have not seen him for two days* (M);

though you may put a *det.* implying *number*, as <sup>أَرَا مِنْهُ</sup> *أَرَا مِنْهُ* though you said *for 30 days* (IY). They have three states (ML), being followed by a *n.* in the *gen.*, a *n.* in the *nom.*, or a *prop.* (DM). When they are followed by a *n.* in the *gen.*, they are said by some to be (ML, A) *pre. ns.* (ML), *advs.* governed in the *acc.* by the *v.* before them ; but are held by most to be *preps.* [510] (A). They are *ns.* (1) when they govern [a single *n.* in (A)] the *nom.* : (2) when they are followed by [a *prop.*, *vid.* (A)] (a) the [*pret.* (Sn)] *v.* (IM) with its *ag.*, which is the prevalent [construction], for which reason IM restrict himself to the mention of it ; (b) the *inch.* with its *enunc.* (A). When they are followed by a *n.* in the *nom.*, [as <sup>مِنْ يَوْمِ</sup> *مِنْ يَوْمِ* (ML),] then, (1) [as Mb, IS, and F say (ML),] they are *inchs.* followed by an *enunc.* (ML, A), i. q. (a) <sup>الْأَمْسَ</sup> *الْأَمْسَ* if the *time* be *present* or *numbered*, [as <sup>مِنْ يَوْمِنَا</sup> *مِنْ يَوْمِنَا* or <sup>مِنْ يَوْمِنَا</sup> *مِنْ يَوْمِنَا* or <sup>مِنْ ثَلَاثَةِ أَيَّامٍ</sup> *مِنْ ثَلَاثَةِ أَيَّامٍ* I have not seen him all through our day or for three days, i. e. the term (of the interruption of the sight) is our day, or three days (DM)]; (b) <sup>أَوَّلَ الْمُدَّةِ</sup> *أَوَّلَ الْمُدَّةِ* if it be *past* (ML), as <sup>مِنْ أَوَّلِ يَوْمِ الْجُمُعَةِ</sup> *مِنْ أَوَّلِ يَوْمِ الْجُمُعَةِ* I have not seen him since Friday, i. e. the beginning of the period (of not seeing) was Friday (DM) : (a) they are permissible as *inchs.*, because they

are *det.* [25] in letter and sense, or in sense only, according to different opinions (Sn) : (b) this analysis (A, DM) is preferred by III (DM) ; [and] is indicated by IM's saying "when they govern the *nom.*" (A), because the *inch.* governs the *enunc.* in the *nom.* [24] (Sn) : (2) [as Akh, Zj, and Zji say (ML, Sn),] they are [adverbial (ML)] *enuncs.* followed by an *inch.* (ML, A), i. q. <sup>بَيْنَ</sup> <sup>وَبَيْنَ</sup> both *pre.*, as <sup>مَا لَقَيْتَهُ</sup> <sup>مَنْ</sup> <sup>يَوْمَانِ</sup> *I have not met him* for two days, i. e. *Between (me) and meeting (him) [158] have been two days* (ML, Sn) ; but there is no concealing the obscurity involved in this (ML) : (a) ISgh says "he that parses them as *inchs.* or *enuncs.* ought to reckon "them among the necessarily *prepos. inchs.* or *enuncs.* [28] ; and that can best be accounted for by the argument that, since they must precede the *gen.* when they "are *preps.*, they must precede [the *enunc.* or *inch.*] when "they are *ns.*" (YS) : (3) as most of the KK say, they are *advs. pre.* to a *prop.* whose *v.* is suppressed while its *ag.* remains, the *o f.* being <sup>مَنْ</sup> <sup>كَانَ</sup> <sup>يَوْمَانِ</sup> *since two days* (have been), [where <sup>كَانَ</sup> is *att.* (DM), or <sup>مَنْ</sup> <sup>مَضَى</sup> <sup>يَوْمَانِ</sup> *since two days* (have passed) (A)] ; and this is preferred by Suh and IM (ML, A) in the Tashīl (A) : (4) as some of the KK say, they [or rather the *ns.* after them (DM)] are *enuncs.* of a suppressed [*pron.*, vid. <sup>هُوَ</sup> (DM)], i. e. <sup>مَا رَأَيْتَهُ</sup> <sup>مِنْ</sup> <sup>الْزَمَانِ</sup> <sup>الَّذِي</sup> <sup>هُوَ</sup> <sup>يَوْمَانِ</sup> *I have not seen him* from that (time which) is two days, upon the ground that

مَنْذٌ is compounded of two words, مَنْ and the Tā'ī نو

[176] (ML), and that مَنْذٌ is *orig.* مَنْذٌ (DM). When they are followed by the verbal or nominal *prop.*, as in مَنْذٌ [112] and

وَمَا زِلْتُ أَبْغِي الْعَالَ مَنْذٌ أَنَا يَافِعٌ  
وَلَيْدًا وَكَهْلًا حِينٌ شَبْتُ وَادْرَسًا

[by AlA'shà, *And I have not ceased to seek wealth, since I was a stripling, when (I was) a boy and middle-aged, when I was hoary, and when (I was) beardless (Jsh)*], then, (1) according to the best known opinion, they are *advs. pre.*, (a) as some say, to the *prop.*, [in which case they are excluded from peculiarity to prefixion to the *n.* of *time*, and their meaning is *from the time when* (DM)]; (b) as others says, to مَنْ [supplied (Sn)] *pre.* to the *prop.*, [in which case their meaning is *from the beginning (of the time when)* (DM)]: (2) as is said, they are *inchs.*, in which case مَنْذٌ must be supplied *pre.* to the *prop.*, as the *enunc.* (ML, A), i. e. *the beginning (of that was the time when) his two hands tied and I was a stripling* (DM). مَنْذٌ and مَنْذٌ are *uninfl.* because they are *ns.* in the sense of *ps.* [510, 159]. They ought to be quiescent [159]: but [the ذ of] مَنْذٌ is mobilized because of the quiescence of the ن before it, and is pro-

nounced with Damm for alliteration [197] to the Damm of the م ; while مَنْ is quiescent, unless it meet a quiescent after it, in which case it is pronounced with Damm, as مَنْ الْيَوْمَ , but by some with Kasr, as مَنْ الْيَوْمَ (IY). The *o. f.* of مَنْ is مَنْ , [the ن being elided from it (DM),] as is proved by their [generally (Sn)] reverting to Damm of the ن in مَنْ upon meeting a quiescent, as مَنْ الْيَوْمَ [663], whereas, if the *o. f.* were not Damm, they would pronounce with Kasr [664]; and by the fact that some of them say مَنْ زَمَنِ طَوِيلٍ , pronouncing with Damm notwithstanding the absence of the quiescent (ML, A).

§ 204. اِنَّ is of four kinds, (1) a *n.* denoting *past time*, and used in four ways, (a) as an *adv.*, which is the prevalent usage, as IX. 40. [below] : (b) as a direct *obj.* [of a *v.* (a) mentioned (DM)], as اِنَّ كُنْتُمْ قَلِيلًا , VII. 84. *And remember the time when ye were few, and He made you many* ; [(b) supplied (DM),] the اِنَّ mentioned in the beginnings of stories in the Revelation being mostly a direct *obj.* of اَنْزَلَ supplied, as اِنَّ قَالَ رَبِّكَ لِلْمَلٰٓئِكَةِ II. 28. *And (remember) the time when thy Lord said unto the angels* [below] : (c) as a *subst.* for the *obj.*, as اِنَّ الْكِتٰبَ مَرِيْمَ اِنْ اَنْتَبَذْتَ XIX. 16.

And remember *Mary* in the Scripture, when she withdrew, [i. e. the time of her withdrawal (DM),] where <sup>ا</sup>اِنْ is a *subst.* of implication for <sup>م</sup>مَرْيَمَ, [the *cop.* (154) being the *pron.* relating to her latent in the *v.* (DM),] like the *subst.* in II. 214. [150]; while <sup>ا</sup>اِنْ in the text <sup>ا</sup>اِنْ كُروا نِعْمَةَ اللّٰهِ عَلَيْكُمْ اِنْ جَعَلَ فِىكُمْ اَنْبِيَاءَ V. 23. Remember ye the grace of God towards you, when He set among you Prophets may be an *adv.* to, or a [total (DM)] *subst.* for, <sup>ا</sup>نِعْمَةً : (d) as *post.* to a *n.* of time, (a) capable of being dispensed with, as in <sup>ا</sup>يَوْمَئِذٍ and <sup>ا</sup>حِينَئِذٍ [201]; (b) incapable of it, as in <sup>ا</sup>رَبَّنَا لَا تَزِغْ قُلُوبَنَا بَعْدَ اِنْ هَدَيْتَنَا III. 6. Our Lord, lead not our hearts astray after the time when Thou hast guided us : (2) a *n.* denoting future time [201], as <sup>ا</sup>يَوْمَئِذٍ تَحْدِثُ اَخْبَارَهَا XCIX. 4. On that day shall she tell her tidings; while the text <sup>ا</sup>فَسَوْفَ يَعْلَمُونَ XL. 72. 73. Therefore they shall know, when the yokes are on their necks is sometimes cited as evidence, because <sup>ا</sup>يَعْلَمُونَ, which is future in letter and sense [404], governs <sup>ا</sup>اِنْ, which must therefore be i. q. <sup>ا</sup>اِنْ : (3) causative, as <sup>ا</sup>اِنْ يَنْفَعَكُمْ الْيَوْمَ XLIII. 38. And it shall not profit you to-day, since ye have done wrong, that ye



are partners in punishment, i. e. And your partnership in punishment shall not profit you to-day, on account of your wrong-doing in the world : (a) this <sup>ا</sup>ذ is alternatively said to be (a) a p., i. q. the causative <sup>ع</sup> [504] ; (b) an adv., the causation being imported from the force of the sentence, not from the letter, because, when <sup>ا</sup>ضربت<sup>ه</sup> <sup>ا</sup>ان<sup>ا</sup> <sup>ا</sup>اساء I beat him when he did evil is said, and <sup>ع</sup>time is meant, the appearance of the case necessarily implies that the evil-doing is the cause of the beating, [because the dependence of the predicament upon a qualification notifies the causality of the latter (DM)]: (b) [<sup>ا</sup>ذ in the text cannot be causative according to the 2nd saying, and (DM)] the difficulty is removed only according to the 1st saying, because, if *The partnership in punishment shall not profit you to-day in the time of your wrong-doing* were said, causation would not be imported on account of the difference in the times of the two acts, [vid. *wrong-doing*, the time of which is the present life, and *profiting*, the time of which is the next life : nay, in reality the difference of time entirely prevents the coherence of the sentence (DM)]; and [thus (DM)] a [further (DM)] difficulty remains in the text [according to the 2nd saying (DM)], vid. that <sup>ا</sup>ذ is not a subst. for <sup>ا</sup>اليوم, because of the difference in the <sup>ع</sup>two times ; nor an adv. to <sup>ا</sup>ينفع, because the latter does not

govern two *adv.* [64]; nor to <sup>مُشْتَرِكُونَ</sup>, because the *reg.* of the *pred.* of the five *ps.* does not precede them [520, 593], nor does the *reg.* of the *conj.* precede the conjunct [75], and because their *partnership* is in the *next life*, not in the *time of their wrong-doing* : (c) other passages attributed to causation are <sup>وَأَنْ كُمْ يَهْتَدُوا بِهِ فُسِّقُولُونَ هَذَا</sup> XLVI. 10. *And, since they have not been guided by it*, [their perversity has become manifest (B),] *so that they will say, This is an old lie*, XVIII. 15. [88], <sup>أَنَّ مَحَلًّا آخِ</sup> [35]; and all of that is correct only according to the saying that the causative <sup>أَنْ</sup> is a *p.*: (4) denotative of *suddenness of occurrence*, as S declares, which is the one [generally] occurring after <sup>بَيْنَمَا</sup> and <sup>بَيْنَا</sup>, as <sup>أَسْتَقْدِرَ اللَّهُ خَيْرًا آخِ</sup> [below]; and is variously said to be an *adv.* of *place* or *time*, a *p.* denoting *suddenness of occurrence*, and a *corrob.*, i. e. *red.* [563], *p.*, [as explained by R below]. Two other meanings are mentioned for <sup>أَنْ</sup>, [in both of which it appears to be a *p.* (DM),] (1) *corroboration*, through its being taken to be *red.*, which is said by AU, followed by IKb [and Jh], who attribute to it certain texts, among them II. 28. [*And thy Lord said* (above) (DM) and II. 48. (below)]; (2) *verification*, like <sup>قَدْ</sup> [575], to which is attributed the text [XLIII. 38. (above) (DM)]: while

ISh adopts the opinion that it occurs *red.* after <sup>١١٢</sup>بَيْنَا and <sup>١١٣</sup>بَيْنَمَا [below] exclusively ; and, according to the theory of *verification* in the text [XLIII. 38. (DM)], the *prop.* [<sup>١١٤</sup>أَنْ ظَلَمْتُمْ, i. e. <sup>١١٥</sup>قَدْ ظَلَمْتُمْ *ye have done wrong* (DM),] is a *par.* between the *v.* and *ag.* [1] (ML). <sup>١١٦</sup>أَنْ is always *pre.* to a *prop.* [115] (R, ML), (1) nominal, as <sup>١١٧</sup>وَإِنْ كُنْتُمْ أَنْتُمْ قَلِيلٌ VIII. 26. *And remember the time when ye were few:* (2) verbal, its *v.* being a *pret.*, (a) in letter and sense, as II. 28. [above], II. 118 [160], and <sup>١١٨</sup>وَإِنْ أَهْلَكَ III. 117. *And remember the time when thou wentest early in the morning from thy household ;* (b) in sense, not letter, as II. 121. [539] and <sup>١١٩</sup>وَإِنْ كَفَرُوا VIII. 30. *And remember the time when they that disbelieved were plotting against thee :* and all three are combined in <sup>١٢٠</sup>وَلَا تَنْصُرُوهُ فَقَدْ نَصَرَهُ اللَّهُ إِذْ أَخْرَجَهُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا ثَانِيَ اثْنَيْنِ إِذْ هُمَا فِي الْغَارِ إِنَّ يَقُولُ IX. 40. *If* [90, 585] *ye help him not, God will help him, as He did help him, when they that disbelieved drove* [above] *him forth, he being a second of two, when they two were in the* [599] *cave, when he was saying to his companion " Grieve thou not* [419]; *verily God is with us*" (ML). But

they disapprove of [its being prefixed to a *n.* followed by a *pret. v.*, as (R)] اِنْ زَيْدٌ قَامَ (M, R), the chaste construction being زَيْدٌ اِنْ قَامَ (R), because اِنْ, being applied to denote the *past*, should rather be prefixed to the *pret.*, on account of the conformity (IY, R) and affinity (R) of their meanings (IY). Sometimes one of the two terms of the *prop.* is suppressed, so that, [when the inflection is not apparent in the other term (DM),] the ignorant think that اِنْ is *pre.* to the single term, as

هَلْ تَرْجِعَنَّ لِيَالٍ قَدْ مَضَيْنَ لَنَا  
وَالْعَيْشُ مُنْقَلِبٌ اِنْ ذَاكَ اَفْنَانًا

[by 'Abd Allāh Ibn AlMu'tazz, *Shall nights* (i.e. *times*), *that have passed for us, indeed return, when life is changed—since that (is so)—like branches?*, i.e. *since life is like branches, sometimes fresh, and sometimes dry* (Jsh)], in full اِنْ ذَاكَ كَذَلِكَ, and

كَانَتْ مَنَازِلُ الْاَلَفِ عَهْدَتِهِمْ  
اِنْ نَحْنُ اِنْ ذَاكَ دُونَ النَّاسِ اِخْوَانًا

by AlAkhtal, i.e. *They were abodes of familiar friends, that I knew as brothers above mankind, when we (were familiar together), when that neighbourhood (was existing)*, in full اِنْ نَحْنُ مَتَالِفُونَ اِنْ ذَاكَ كَائِنٌ, what is

demonstrated by ذَاكَ being the *neighbourhood* understood from the sentence, and

كَانَ لَمْ يَكُونُوا حِمًى يَتَّقَى \* إِنَّ النَّاسَ إِنْ ذَاكَ مِنْ عَزِيزًا  
by AlKhansá, i.e. *As though they were not a sanctuary that is respected, when mankind are such that he of them that overcomes robs, when that* [overcoming (DM)] (*is existing*), in full إِنْ ذَاكَ كَانَتْ (ML): and sometimes the [whole (ML)] *prop.* is suppressed, because known, and TanwIn is put as a compensation for it, [as

نَهَيْتَكَ عَنْ طَلَابِكَ أُمِّ عَمْرٍو \* بِعَافِيَةٍ وَأَنْتَ إِنْ صَحِيحٌ  
(R), by Abù Dhu'aib alHudhali, *I prohibited thee, O heart, from thy courting Umm 'Amr in health, while thou wast then well* (Jsh),] in which case the ن [of إِنْ (R)] is pronounced with Kasr [608] (R, ML) or Fath [201]; but always with Kasr in such as يَوْمَئِذٍ (R), as وَيَوْمَئِذٍ يُفْرَجُ XXX. 3. *And on that day shall the believers be glad* (ML), i.e. وَيَوْمَ يَغْلِبُ الرُّومُ *And on the day when (the Greeks shall overcome)* [502] (B). إِنْ is not like إِنْ in denoting *condition*, [because its *time* is *past*, while *condition* is *future* (IY),] unless it be restrained [by مَ from prefixion (IY)], as in the saying of Al'Abbās Ibn Mirdās [asSulamī (Jsh)]

اِذَا دَخَلْتَ عَلَى الرَّسُولِ فَقُلْ لَهُ  
حَقًّا عَلَيْكَ اِذَا اطمان المجلس

(M) *Whenever thou enterest before the Apostle, say thou to him, with a saying that has become necessarily incumbent* (in full  $\text{حَقًّا} \text{لَكَ} \text{قَوْلًا} \text{حَقًّا}$ , i. e.  $\text{رُجِبَ} \text{وَجُوبًا}$ ) *upon thee, when the assembly is still* (AAz), because, being restrained by  $\text{مَا}$  from the prefixion [565] explanatory of its sense, it becomes vague (IY).  $\text{اِذَا}$  is an instrument of *condition*, that [seldom (DM)] apocopates two *vs.* (ML), being mostly *inop.* (DM). It is, (1) according to S, a *p.* [419], i. q. [the *cond.* (ML)]  $\text{اِنْ}$  (R on the *apoc.*, M<sup>r</sup>); (2) according to Mb, IS, and F, an *adv.* (ML): (a) perhaps S considers that, when the word  $\text{مَا}$  is affixed to  $\text{اِذَا}$ , the latter already contains the sense of *condition*, and is *future*, even if it be prefixed to the *pret.*, like  $\text{اِنْ}$ ; so that it becomes an apocopative with  $\text{مَا}$ : whereas this cannot be the case with  $\text{اِذَا}$ , which is devoid of the sense of *condition*, and is applied to denote the *past*; so that  $\text{اِذَا}$ , according to him, is not compounded: (b) Sf says “I have not known any of the GG mention  $\text{اِذَا}$ , except S and his school; and S cites [only] two “verses,  $\text{اِذَا دَخَلْتَ الْخ}$  [above] and  $\text{فَاِذَا تَرَيْتَنِي الْيَوْمَ الْخ}$ ”

“ [589] : and one of the GG says that its *o. f.* is <sup>ء</sup>أما , which  
 “ does not occur except with the *corrob.* <sup>ء</sup>ن after it [613],  
 “ as in XIX. 26. [544]; so that, since [the metre of]  
 “ the verse would be violated by the <sup>ء</sup>ن , the form of <sup>ء</sup>أما  
 “ is changed by conversion of the 1st م into ن ; but this  
 “ [explanation] is not complete in <sup>ء</sup>أَنْمَا دَخَلَتْ آخَ : (c)  
 Mb says that [ <sup>ء</sup>أَنْ in ] <sup>ء</sup>أَنْمَا retains its nominality; but  
 that <sup>ء</sup>مَا restrains it from seeking prefixion, and adapts it to  
*condition* and apocopation, as in the case of <sup>ء</sup>حَيْثُ [202];  
 for by means of <sup>ء</sup>مَا it becomes future and apocopative  
 (R). Its government of the *apoc.* [419] is rare [in prose  
 and poetry (DM)]; but is not a poetic license, contrary  
 to the opinion of some. <sup>ء</sup>أَنْ is used in two ways:—  
 (1) it denotes *suddenness of occurrence*, in which case [it  
 differs from the *cond.* <sup>ء</sup>أَنْ in four matters, vid. that (DM)]  
 it is peculiar to nominal *props.*, does not need a *correl.*,  
 nor occur at the beginning [of the sentence (DM)], and  
 means the *present*, not the *future*, (i. e. indicates that  
*what follows it is realized during the realization of what*  
*precedes it*, as Shm demonstrates, even if they be both  
*past* (DM),] as <sup>ء</sup>خَرَجْتُ فَأَنْمَا الْأَسَدُ بِالْبَابِ *I went out; and*  
 [540] *lo, or there, or then, the* [599] *lion was at the door,*  
 whence <sup>ء</sup>فَالْقَاهَا فَأَنْمَا آخَ ; XX. 21. *Then he cast it down,*





but others hold that its *op.* is the *enunc.*, mentioned, as in <sup>٩</sup>فَإِذَا <sup>٩</sup>زَيْدٌ <sup>٩</sup>جَالِسٌ, or supplied, as in <sup>٩</sup>فَإِذَا <sup>٩</sup>الْأَسَدُ, i. e. <sup>٩</sup>حَاضِرٌ; and that, when <sup>٩</sup>إِذَا itself is construed to be the *enunc.* [in such as <sup>٩</sup>فَإِذَا <sup>٩</sup>الْأَسَدُ (DM)], its *op.* is <sup>٩</sup>مُسْتَقَرٌّ or <sup>٩</sup>اِسْتَقَرَّ [26, 498]: (c) the *enunc.* with it always occurs expressed in the Revelation, as XXI. 97. [160], <sup>٩</sup>فَإِذَا هُمْ <sup>٩</sup>خَامِدُونَ XXXVI. 28. *And lo, or there, or then, they were still*, and <sup>٩</sup>فَإِذَا هِيَ <sup>٩</sup>بَيْضَاءُ VIII. 105. *And lo, or there, or then, it was white*: (d) when <sup>٩</sup>فَإِذَا <sup>٩</sup>الْأَسَدُ <sup>٩</sup>خَرَجَتْ *I went forth, and there was the lion!* is said, <sup>٩</sup>إِذَا may be an *enunc.* according to Mb, i. e. <sup>٩</sup>فَإِذَا <sup>٩</sup>الْأَسَدُ <sup>٩</sup>فِيهَا <sup>٩</sup>لَحْضَرَةٌ; but not according to Zj, because the [*adv. of*] *time* is not an *enunc.* of a concrete *n.* [26]; nor according to Akh, because the *p.* is neither predicable nor predicable of [497]: whereas, if you say <sup>٩</sup>فَإِذَا <sup>٩</sup>الْقَتَالُ *and there, or then, was fighting*, [like the version <sup>٩</sup>إِذَا <sup>٩</sup>أَنَّهُ <sup>٩</sup>عَبْدُ <sup>٩</sup>الْقَفَا <sup>٩</sup>الْخ (519) with Fath,] it may be an *enunc.* according to others than Akh: (e) you say <sup>٩</sup>فَإِذَا <sup>٩</sup>زَيْدٌ <sup>٩</sup>جَالِسٌ or <sup>٩</sup>جَالِسًا *I went forth, and there, or then, Zaid was sitting, or and there was Zaid, sitting, or and then Zaid (was present) sitting*, with (a) the *nom.* as an *enunc.*, <sup>٩</sup>إِذَا being gov-

erved in the *acc.* by it: (b) the *acc.* as a *d. s.*, the *enunc.* being <sup>اِذَا</sup>, if it be called an [*adv. of*] *place*; and, if not, then suppressed, [i. e. <sup>حَاضِرٌ</sup> (DM)]: (f) you may construe <sup>اِذَا</sup> to be an *enunc.* of a concrete *n.* [in appearance, but of an abstract *n.* in reality (DM)], notwithstanding our calling it an [*adv. of*] *time* [26], when you assume the suppression of a *pre. n.*, as <sup>خَرَجْتُ فَإِذَا الْأَسَدُ</sup> *I went forth, and then was (the presence of) the lion*, constructively <sup>قَدْ كُنْتُ أَظُنُّ فَإِذَا حُضُورُ الْأَسَدِ</sup>: (g) the Arabs say <sup>أَنَّ الْعَقْرَبَ أَشَدَّ لِسْعَةً مِنَ الزَّنْبُورِ فَإِذَا هُوَ هِيَ</sup> *I was wont to think that the scorpion was sharper in stinging than the hornet, and lo, he is as sharp as she*, and <sup>فَإِذَا هُوَ أَيَّهَا</sup> also: but this [2nd (DM)] construction was disapproved by S when he was questioned by Ks; and <sup>فَإِذَا هُوَ هِيَ</sup> is the proper construction, like VII. 105. and XX. 21; while <sup>فَإِذَا هُوَ أَيَّهَا</sup>, if authentic, is irregular and inelegant, like the government of the *apoc.* by <sup>لَنْ</sup> [549], the *subj.* by <sup>لَمْ</sup> [548], and the *gen.* by <sup>لَعَلَّ</sup> [513] (ML): (h) <sup>اِذَا</sup> [denoting *suddenness of occurrence* (IY)] is used like the <sup>ف</sup> in the *correl.* of the condition, [because of the approximation of their meanings, *suddenness of occurrence* and *succession* (IY),] as XXX. 35. [1, 419] (M)

and XXX. 24. [above] (K, B): (2) it denotes *something else than suddenness of occurrence*, in which case (a) it is mostly an *adv.* of the *future*, implying the sense of *condition*, and peculiar to prefixion to verbal *props.*, being [in all of this] contrary to the one that denotes *suddenness of occurrence*, with which it is combined in XXX. 24. [above] and عَبَادَةٍ مِّنْ يَّشَاءُ مِّنْ اٰنَا XXX. 47. [below] *And, when He watereth with it those of His servants whom He willeth, lo, or there, or then, they are glad!* (ML): (a) as اٰنَا is prefixed to the *pret.*, so it is prefixed to the *aor.* (K, B on XLII. 28), as XCII. 1. [498], whence وَهُوَ عَلَىٰ جَمْعِهِمْ اٰنَا XLII. 28. *And He, when He willeth, is able to gather them together and*

وَإِنَّا مَا أَشَاءَ أَبْعَثُ مِنْهَا \* أَخْرَ اللَّيْلِ نَاشِطًا مَّذْعُورًا

(K) *And, whenever I will, I rouse her (the she-camel) for the journey at the end of the night, so that she speeds along as though she were a terrified wild bull (N); [but] the v. after it is often a pret., and less often an aor., both of which are combined in the saying of Abū Dhu'aib [alHudhalī (Jshī]*

وَالنَّفْسُ رَاجِبَةٌ إِذَا رَغِبَتْهَا \* وَإِذَا تَرَدَّدَتْ إِلَى قَلِيلٍ تَقْنَعُ

*[And the soul of man is craving when thou makest it crave; and, when it is reduced to a little, it is content*

(Jsh)]: (b) the *cond.* اِذَا is prefixed to the *n.* in such as LXXXIV. 1. [23, 201] only because the *n.* is an *ag.* to a *v.* suppressed upon condition of being expounded, not an *inch.*, contrary to the opinion of Akh, [who allows اِذَا to be prefixed to the *inch.* provided that the latter be followed by a *v.* (DM)]; and, as for the saying [of AlFarazdaq (Mb, Jsh)]

اِذَا بَاهِلِي تَحْتَهُ حَنْظَلِيَّةٌ \* لَوْ وَلَدَ مِنْهَا فَذَاكَ الْمَدْرَعُ

[When a man of the tribe of Bāhila, under whom is a woman of the tribe of Hanẓala, has a child by her, that child will be the mail-clad warrior, where the *n.* mentioned after اِذَا is not followed by a *v.*, بَاهِلِي is not an *inch.*, but (DM)] the full phrase is اِذَا كَانَ بَاهِلِي (ML), so that بَاهِلِي is *sub.* of كَانَ, the *pred.* of which is لَوْ وَلَدَ (DM): (c) اِذَا does not govern the *apoc.*, [notwithstanding its signifying *condition*, and being i. q. مَتَى (206) (R),] except in poetry (R, ML), as

اِسْتَعْنِ مَا اَعْطَاكَ رَبُّكَ بِالْغِنَى \* وَاِذَا تُصِيبَكَ خُصَاصَةٌ فَتَجَمَّلِ

[by 'Abd Kāis Ibn Khufāf {alBurjūmī (T)}, admonishing his son Jamīl, *Be content with competence, so long as thy Lord gives thee a competence; and, when poverty befalls thee, show resignation* (Jsh)]: (b) it is said to be

sometimes excluded from *adverbiality*, *futurity*, and the sense of *condition*; and each of these shall have a separate paragraph: (a) as for its exclusion from *adverbiality*, Akh asserts on XXXIX. 71. 73. [539] that إِذَا is [a n. of time (DM)] governed in the gen. by حَتَّى [below], [i. e. *Until the time of their coming to it* (DM)]; and IJ asserts on the reading إِذَا وَقَعَتِ الْوَاقِعَةُ لَيْسَ إِذَا لَوْقَعَتِهَا كَذِبَةٌ خَافِضَةٌ رَافِعَةٌ إِذَا رَجَّتِ الْأَرْضُ رَجًّا LVI. 1-3. *The time when the resurrection shall come to pass, while not a lying (soul) shall be at* [the ل being i. q. فِي (DM)] *its coming to pass, abasing some, exalting others, will be the time when the earth shall be shaken with violent shaking* that the 1st إِذَا is an *inch.* and the 2nd an *enunc.*, the two accs. being *ds. s.*, as likewise is the *prop.* of لَيْسَ and its two regs. [لَوْقَعَتِهَا كَذِبَةٌ (DM)], i. e. *The time of the resurrection's coming to pass will be the time of the earth's being shaken*; and they say on the verse of the Ḥamāsī [Abu-ṭṬamahān alKainī (T)]

وَقَبْلَ غَدٍ يَا لَهْفٍ نَفْسِي عَلَى غَدٍ

إِذَا رَاحَ اصْحَابِي وَلَسْتُ بِرَائِعٍ

[*And before the morrow—O the grief of my soul for the morrow, for the time when my companions will return, and I shall not be returning!* (T)] that إِذَا is in the position

of a *gen.* as a *subst.* for [the 2nd] <sup>غَدِ</sup> غَدِ, [or of an *acc.* as a *subst.* for the position of <sup>عَلَى</sup> عَلَى (498) (T)]; and IM asserts that it occurs as an *obj.* in the saying of the Prophet to 'Ā'isha <sup>إِنِّي لَأَعْلَمُ إِذَا كُنْتُ عَنِ رَاضِيَةٍ وَإِذَا</sup> <sup>كُنْتُ عَلَى غَضَبِي</sup> *Verily I do know the time when thou art pleased with me, and the time when thou art in anger against me:* (b) its exclusion from *futurity* is through its denoting (a) the *past*, as <sup>أَن</sup> أَن denotes the *future*, as IX. 93. [80], LXII. 11. [538] <sup>وَنَدَمَانِ يَزِيدُ الْخُ</sup> *And, when they saw etc., they dispersed etc.,* and [18]: (β) the *present*, vid. after the oath [from God, as will be seen (DM),] as XCII. 1. [498] and <sup>وَالنَّجْمِ إِذَا هَوَى</sup> *LIII. 1. By the Pleiades [11] when they set [below],* because, as is said, if it denoted the *future*, it would not be an *adv.* to the *v.* of the oath, [i. e. <sup>أَقْسَمُ</sup> أَقْسَمُ (DM),] because this *v.* is originative, not enunciatory of an oath to come, since the oath of God is ancient; nor to a suppressed *being* serving as a *d. s.* to <sup>الليل</sup> اللَّيْلِ and <sup>النَّجْمِ</sup> النَّجْمِ, because the <sup>حَالِ</sup> حَال and the *future* are incompatible: whereas the truth is that dependence upon the originative <sup>أَقْسَمُ</sup> أَقْسَمُ is not correct, because the ancient has no *time*, either *present* or *otherwise*, being anterior to *time*; but that dependence upon <sup>كَأَنَّا</sup> كَأَنَّا, notwithstanding that <sup>إِذَا</sup> إِذَا remains in the *future*, is

not impossible, [because the *حال* incompatible with the future is the *temporal*, not the *grammatical* one (DM), i. e. the *present time*, not the *d. s.*,] as is proved by the fact that the occurrence of the presumptive *d. s.* [74] is correct by common consent: (c) the exclusion of *إِذَا* from *conditionality* is exemplified in *وَإِذَا مَا غَضِبُوا هُمْ* XLII. 35. *And who, when they are wroth, forgive* and *وَالَّذِينَ إِذَا أَصَابَهُمُ الْبَغْيُ هُمْ يَنْتَصِرُونَ* XLII. 37. *And who, when wrong befalls them, help themselves*, in both of which *exs.* *إِذَا* is an *adv.* to the *enunc.* of the *inch.* after it; whereas, if it were *cond.*, and the nominal *prop.* a *correl.*, this *prop.* would be conjoined with the *ف* [but see (f) below]: and hence the *إِذَا* that follows the oath, as in XCII. 1. and LIII. 1. [above] (ML): (c) since the introduction of the sense of *condition* into *إِذَا* and its exclusion from its original sense of *specified time* [206] are frequent, it may, even if it be not i. q. the *cond.* *إِن*, vid. in the case of *decided matters*, be used in the same way as the *إِذَا* implying the sense of *إِن*, vid. in being followed by two *props.* in the guise of the *prot.* and *apod.*, although they are not such, as CX. 1-3. [540], in order that this arrangement may indicate that the purport of the 2nd *prop.* is as inseparable from the purport of

the 1st *prop.* as the *apod.* from the *prot.*; and it is for the realization of this object that [the *non-cond.*] اِذَا is governed by its [apparent] *apod.*, notwithstanding that the latter follows a *p.* such that what precedes it is not governed by what follows it, like the ف in CX. 3., اِنَّ in اِذَا جِئْتَنِيْ فَانْكَ مَكْرَمٌ When thou comest to me, verily thou wilt be honored, and the ل in XIX. 67. [600] (R):

(d) what governs اِذَا [in the *acc.* (ML)] is (a) its *prot.*, [as some say (R), which is the opinion of critical judges (ML),] so that it is like مَتَى [206] (R, ML), and accordingly should be parsed not as “a *n.* of *time* governing “its *prot.* in the *gen.*, and governed in the *acc.* by its “*correl.*,” but only as “a *n.* of *condition* governed in the “*acc.* by its *prot.*” (DM); and the objection of AB that this opinion is refuted by the fact that the *pre.* is not governed by the *post.* does not apply, because اِذَا according to these [critical judges (DM)] is not *pre.* [201], as all say when it governs the *apoc.*, as in اِسْتَعْنِيْ مَا آَلَخ [above] (ML): (b) [the *v.* or the like in (ML)] its *apod.*, which is the saying of most (R, ML), but is open to various objections (ML): it is best, however, to make a distinction, and say that, if اِذَا implies the sense of *condition*, its predicament is like that of مَتَى; but that, if not, as in اِذَا غَرَبَتِ الشَّمْسُ جِئْتُكَ When the sun sets



*I will come to thee*, i. e. *I will come to thee at the time of the setting of the sun*, its *op.* is the *v.* that is in the place of an *apod.* by usage, though it is not an *apod.* in reality, not the *v.* that is in the place of the *prot.*, since this *v.* particularizes the *adv.* by being *post.* to it [111], as in the case of the rest of the *adv.* epithetically particularized [140] by the purport of the *props.* after them, as <sup>لَئِنْ جِئْتَهُمْ</sup> <sup>يَوْمَ يَجْمَعُ</sup> <sup>اللَّهُ</sup> <sup>الرَّسُلَ</sup> V. 108. *On the day when God will assemble the Apostles*, and the *post.* does not govern the *pre.*: for in every two or more words, that are equivalent in sense to a single word, because they occur together as a part of a sentence, the 1st may govern the 2nd, as the *pre.* governs the *post.* [110]; but the converse is not allowable, since no single word is known one of whose parts is *prepos.* in one respect and *postpos.* in another, and similarly therefore what is equivalent to a single word in sense, for which reason a *conj.* does not govern a conjunct, nor an *appos.* an *ant.*, nor a *post.* a *pre.*: whereas the *cond.* word, when governed by the *prot.*, is not together with the *prot.* like a single word, since they do not then occur in the place of a single word, like the *ag.*, *obj.*, *inch.*, and the like; so that each of them may govern the other, as <sup>مَتَى</sup> <sup>تَذْهَبُ</sup> <sup>أَذْهَبُ</sup> and XVII. 110. [116]: (e) the *ف* in such as CX. 3. [540] is [not illative, but] *red.*, because the illative *ف* is not devoid of the sense of *succession*, whereas <sup>إِذَا</sup> <sup>جَاءَ</sup> <sup>ع</sup>

is an *adv.* to the *extolling*, which was not to be in succession to, but in the time of, the *coming*: (f) <sup>أ</sup>إِذَا, being neither radically nor permanently *cond.*, may, notwithstanding its being *cond.*, (a) have for its *apod.* a nominal *prop.* without a <sup>ف</sup> [419], as in XLII. 35. and XLII. 37. [above]; (b) be followed by a nominal [*prop.*] devoid of *v.*, though this is anomalous, as

فَهَلَّا أَعْدُونِي امْتَلِي تَفَاقَدُوا  
إِذَا الْخَصَمُ ابْزَى مَائِلَ الرَّاسِ انْكَبَ

[by one of the Banù Fak'as, said to be Murra Ibn 'Addá alFak'asī, *And wherefore have they not prepared me for my like (may they lose one another!)*, when the foe is sticking out the chest, bending the head, lowering the shoulder, i. e. *is lurking in ambush?* (T)]: (g) <sup>أ</sup>إِذَا, when it occurs after <sup>حَتَّى</sup>حَتَّى, as <sup>أ</sup>إِذَا هَلَكَ قَلْتُمْ, XL. 36. So that, when he died, ye even said, continues to require two *props.*, and is governed in the *acc.* by the last of them; while <sup>حَتَّى</sup>حَتَّى with it is an inceptive *p.* [501]: but some say that <sup>أ</sup>إِذَا after <sup>حَتَّى</sup>حَتَّى may be divested of *adverbiality*, and be <sup>ع</sup>governed in the *gen.* by <sup>حَتَّى</sup>حَتَّى [above]; and perhaps they attribute to this the saying <sup>أ</sup>إِذَا اسْلَكُوهُمْ الْخ <sup>ع</sup>حَتَّى Until the time when they made etc. [below], this verse being the last of the ode: (h) <sup>أ</sup>إِذَا, when followed by <sup>مَا</sup>مَا, remains as it was before, not



and a herdsman's fire-sticks (Jsh), and <sup>بَيْنَا تَعْنَقَهُ الْكَمَاةُ الْخ</sup>

[497] (IY). The [idiom] heard from the Arabs is

<sup>بَيْنَا زَيْدٌ قَامَ جَاءَ عَمْرُو</sup> without <sup>اِنْ</sup>, because the sense is

*Between the intervals of the time [when Zaid stood]*

'Amr came, whence <sup>بَيْنَا تَعْنَقَهُ الْخ</sup>; whereas <sup>بَيْنَمَا</sup> occurs

sometimes not combined with <sup>اِنْ</sup>, like <sup>بَيْنَا</sup>, and some-

times combined with <sup>اِنْ</sup> or <sup>اِذَا</sup>, as

<sup>فَاسْتَقْدِرَ الْمَلِكُ خَيْرًا وَارْضِينَ بِهِ \* فَبَيْنَمَا الْحَسَرُ اِنْ دَارَتْ مِبَاسِيرُ</sup>

<sup>وَبَيْنَمَا الْمَرْءُ فِي الْاَحْيَاءِ مَغْتَبِطًا \* اِذَا هُوَ الرَّمْسُ تَعْفُوهُ الْاَعَاصِيرُ</sup>

[above] (D), by 'Ithyar Ibn Labīd al'Udhri, or Huraith

Ibn Jabala, *Then pray thou God to decree thee good,*

*and do thou be satisfied with it; for, while there was*

*hardship, there, or then, or lo, easy times came round!*

*And, while man is envied for his prosperity among living*

*beings, there, or then, or lo, he is the dust that the*

*whirlwinds obliterate!* (Jsh). Since <sup>بَيْنَ</sup>, which is

always *pre.* to the single term, is intended to be *pre.* to

the *prop.*, and prefixion to the *prop.* is like no prefixion

[201, 202], the restraining <sup>اِ</sup> is redundantly affixed to

it [565]; or the Fatha is impleted [497], so that an <sup>اِ</sup>

is engendered, in order that the <sup>اِ</sup> may indicate that <sup>بَيْنَ</sup>

does not require a *post.* [n.], because it is as it were

paused upon, and the { is sometimes put for pause, as in  
 اِنَّا [161, 497, 615, 648]. بَيْنَ, being orig. an *inf. n.*  
 meaning *separation*, is used to denote *time* and *place* ;  
 whereas, when restrained by مَا or the {, and *pre.* to  
*props.*, it denotes only *time*, because no [*n. of*] *place* is  
*pre.* to *props.*, except حَيْثُ [124, 201] : but بَيْنَ is really  
*pre.* to a *n. of time pre.* to the *prop.*, the full phrase  
 being بَيْنَ اَوْقَاتٍ زَيْدٌ قَائِمٌ *Between (the times when) Zaid*  
*was standing*, i. e. *Between the times of Zaid's standing* ;  
 and the *n. of time* being suppressed because indicated by  
 the circumstance that *ns. pre.* to *props.* are mostly *ns.*  
*of time*, not *ns. of place* and others. All that we have  
 said about بَيْنَ, as to the occurrence of the restraining  
 مَا in order to restrain it from requiring a single *post. n.*,  
 and as to supplying a *n. of time pre.* to the *props.*,  
 is equally applicable to كَلِمًا [117, 181] : but since كَلِمًا  
 contains the sense of *generality* and *totality*, which is  
 contained in *cond.* words, like مَن [206], مَا, and مَتَى,  
 it resembles them more than بَيْنَ does ; so that it is  
 prefixed only to the verbal [*prop.*], contrary to بَيْنَ and  
 بَيْنَ ; and for the same reason the *pret.* after it may  
 occur in the sense of the *future* [615]. بَيْنَ, بَيْنَ, and  
 كَلِمًا are prefixed to the *pret.* and *future*. We may hazard

the conjecture that [ <sup>أَ</sup>بَيْنَا and <sup>وَسَّ</sup>كُلَّ in ] <sup>أَ</sup>بَيْنَا, <sup>أَ</sup>بَيْنَمَا, and <sup>وَسَّ</sup>كَلِمَا are *uninfl.*, because their prefixion [to a *prop.*] is like no prefixion, as we said of <sup>أَ</sup>حَيْثُ [202], except that they are *uninfl.* upon the Fath that they were entitled to in the state of inflection, contrary to <sup>وَسَّ</sup>حَيْثُ, because no state of inflection exists for the latter in which it is governed in the *acc.*, so that its inflectional vowel might be observed. <sup>أَ</sup>بَيْنَا, <sup>أَ</sup>بَيْنَمَا and <sup>وَسَّ</sup>كَلِمَا with their two *props.* are arranged in the same way as *cond.* words with the *prot.* and *apod.*, in order to explain that the purport of the 2nd is as inseparable from [the purport of] the 1st as the *apod.* from the *prot.*; and for this reason <sup>أَ</sup>إِذَا and <sup>أَ</sup>إِذَا are prefixed to the *correl.* of <sup>أَ</sup>بَيْنَا and <sup>أَ</sup>بَيْنَمَا, in order <sup>ع</sup>that they may indicate the *conjunction of the purport of the 2nd with [the purport of] the 1st suddenly, without delay*, so that the *correl.* may be more confirmed in the sense of inseparability. But [ <sup>وَسَّ</sup>كُلَّ in ] <sup>وَسَّ</sup>كَلِمَا is said to be [*pre.* to a single term, and therefore] *infl.*, <sup>أَ</sup>مَا being infinitival, and a *n. of time pre.* to <sup>أَ</sup>مَا being supplied [571]; and the like may therefore be asserted of <sup>أَ</sup>بَيْنَمَا. When <sup>أَ</sup>إِذَا and <sup>أَ</sup>إِذَا denoting *suddenness of occurrence* are prefixed <sup>ع</sup>to the *correl.*, then, if you say, as Mb holds, that <sup>أَ</sup>إِذَا is an *adv. of place*, as likewise he ought to say

of <sup>أَن</sup>, they are governed in the *acc.* as *adv.* of *place* to what follows them, while <sup>بَيْنَا</sup> and <sup>بَيْنَمَا</sup> are *adv.* of *time* to it, so that the sense of <sup>بَيْنَا</sup> <sup>زَيْدٌ</sup> <sup>قَائِمٌ</sup> <sup>أَن</sup> <sup>رَأَى</sup> <sup>هِنْدًا</sup> is *Zaid saw Hind while Zaid was standing, there he saw Hind* is *Zaid saw Hind between (the times of) his standing, [saw her] in that place, i. e. in the place of his standing*; and, if we say, as Zj holds, that they are *adv.* of *time*, they are *pre.* to the *prop.* after them, excluded from *adverbiality*, *inchs.* whose *enunc.* is <sup>بَيْنَا</sup> or <sup>بَيْنَمَا</sup>, the sense being [*While etc., was the time when he saw Hind, i. e.*] *The time of Zaid's seeing Hind was between (the times of) his standing*: but it is best to say, as IBr holds, that they are *ps.*, in which case the *op.* of <sup>بَيْنَا</sup> and <sup>بَيْنَمَا</sup> is what follows the two words denoting *suddenness of occurrence*; or we may say that <sup>أَن</sup> and <sup>أَنَا</sup> are *red.*, and do not denote *suddenness of occurrence* in the *correl.* of <sup>بَيْنَا</sup> and <sup>بَيْنَمَا</sup>, as AU, IKb, and Jh say that <sup>أَن</sup> is *red.* in such as <sup>وَأَن</sup> <sup>وَأَعَدْنَا</sup> II. 48 *And We appointed*, and <sup>أَن</sup> in such as

حَتَّىٰ أَنَا أَسْلَكُوهُمْ فِي قَتَائِدَةٍ \* شَلَا كَمَا تَطُرُ الْجَمَالَةُ الشُّرَا

[by 'Abd Manāf {Ibn Rib' (Bk)} alHudhalī (Bk, N), *Until they made them pass through the mountain-road named Kutā'ida, driving them along, as the owners of camels urge on the shying ones (N)*]. And the analysis

of such as XXX. 47. [above] is exactly like that of  
<sup>ع</sup>ا<sup>م</sup>را <sup>ع</sup>ا<sup>م</sup>را <sup>ع</sup>ا<sup>م</sup>را <sup>ع</sup>ا<sup>م</sup>را <sup>ع</sup>ا<sup>م</sup>را [or <sup>ه</sup>ن<sup>د</sup>ا <sup>ا</sup>ذ<sup>ا</sup>]. Or <sup>ا</sup>ذ<sup>ا</sup> in the  
 correl. of <sup>ب</sup>ي<sup>ن</sup>م<sup>ا</sup>, [as <sup>ب</sup>ي<sup>ن</sup>م<sup>ا</sup> <sup>ا</sup>ل<sup>م</sup>ر<sup>ء</sup> <sup>ا</sup>ل<sup>خ</sup> (above),] of <sup>ا</sup>ذ<sup>ا</sup>,  
 [as XXX. 47.,] and of <sup>ل</sup>م<sup>ا</sup>, as <sup>ف</sup>ل<sup>م</sup>ا <sup>ك</sup>ت<sup>ب</sup> <sup>ع</sup>ل<sup>ي</sup>ه<sup>م</sup> <sup>ا</sup>ل<sup>ق</sup>ت<sup>ال</sup> <sup>ا</sup>ذ<sup>ا</sup>, as  
<sup>ا</sup>ف<sup>ر</sup>ي<sup>ق</sup> <sup>م</sup>ن<sup>ه</sup>م IV. 79. And, when fighting hath been ordained  
 unto them, then a party of them [206], may be an *adv.*  
 of time, a *subst.* for the *advs.* mentioned [*while, or*  
*when—then*]; and we do not hold it to be *pre.* to the  
*prop.* after it, but hold that *prop.* to govern the *advs.*  
 mentioned, i. e. *in the time of the watering, in that state,*  
*they are glad*, and similarly in the rest. Thus [in this  
 last construction] the *prop. post.* to <sup>ا</sup>ذ<sup>ا</sup> is suppressed,  
 indicated by the *prop.* that is in the position of the *prot.*,  
 i. e. *when (He watereth them), they are glad* and *when*  
*(it hath been ordained), a party of them*; and so we say  
 when <sup>ا</sup>ذ<sup>ا</sup> occurs as correl. of <sup>ا</sup>ن in such as XXX. 35.  
 [1,419], i. e. *when (it befalleth them), they despair*, i. e.  
*in that state they despair*: whereas, if we say that [in  
 the last text] it is an *adv.* of place, we do not supply  
 for it a *prop. post.* to it, because the [*n. of*] place is not  
*pre.* to the *prop.*, except <sup>ح</sup>ي<sup>ث</sup> [124, 201], but the sense  
 is *in that place they despair*; and so in the correl. of <sup>ب</sup>ي<sup>ن</sup>م<sup>ا</sup>,  
<sup>ا</sup>ذ<sup>ا</sup>, and <sup>ل</sup>م<sup>ا</sup>: while, if we say that <sup>ا</sup>ذ<sup>ا</sup> in the correl.  
 of the four things is a *p.*, there is no difficulty [about the



*op.* and *posi.*], because اَنْ is then a *p.*, exactly like the ف [540]. Sometimes اَنْ denotes *suddenness of occurrence* in something else than the *correl.* of بَيْنَا and بَيْنَمَا, as كُنْتُ واقفاً اَنْ جاءني عمرو *I was standing still: there, or then, or lo, 'Amr came to me.* And بَيْنَا may be *pre.* to the *inf. n.*, contrary to بَيْنَمَا, as بَيْنَا تَعَانَقَةً [497], in full اَوْقَاتُ بَيْنَا تَعَانَقَةً *between (the times of) his embracing;* but the best known [version] is the *nom.*, as an *inch.* whose *enunc.* is suppressed, i. e. بَيْنَا تَعَانَقَةً حَاصِلٌ *while his embracing (was being realized) (R).*

§ 205. اَنْ is i. q. اَعِنٌ [115], except that it is peculiar in 6 matters (A):—(1) it [always (A)] denotes *beginning of extent* (R, IA, A) in *time* or *place* (R, IA, Sn), as اَنْ صَبَاحٍ *From daybreak* and اَنْ حَكِيمٍ عَلِيمٍ *From a wise, knowing One* (R), thereby differing from اَنْ [499] (R, Sn), as we [i. e. the BB] say (R); and hence اَعِنٌ and اَنْ alternate in such as جِئْتُ مِنْ اَعِنٌ and جِئْتُ مِنْ اَنْ, [vid. when the inceptive اَنْ is prefixed to اَعِنٌ (Sn),] e. g. اَتَيْنَا رَحْمَةً مِنْ اَعِنٌ وَعِلْمَانَا *Unto whom We had vouchsafed mercy from Us, and whom We had taught knowledge*

from *Us*, contrary to <sup>جَلَسْتُ</sup> <sup>عِنْدَهُ</sup> *I sat by him*, where <sup>جَلَسْتُ</sup> <sup>لَدُنْكَ</sup> is not allowable, because the sense of *beginning* is wanting here (A): but, when *pre.* to the *prop.*, <sup>لَدُنْ</sup> becomes purely denotative of *time*, because the only *adv. of place pre. to the prop.* is <sup>حَيْثُ</sup> [124, 201], as

صَرِيحٌ غَوَانٍ رَاقِئِينَ وَرَقْنَةً  
لَدُنْ شَبِّ حَتَّى شَابَ سَوْدُ الذَّوَائِبِ

[by AlKutāmī, *Smitten by blooming maids, that he pleased, and that pleased him, from the time that he became a youth until the black locks grew white* (FA)]; while the *prop.* may be headed by an infinitival *p.* [201], since <sup>لَدُنْ</sup> is not *orig.* purely denotative of *time*, as

فَإِنَّ الْكَثْرَ أَعْيَانِي قَدِيمًا \* وَلَمْ أَقْتَرِ لَدُنْ أَنِي غَلَامٌ

by ‘Amr Ibn Ḥassān, *For verily wealth eluded me of old; nor was I poor from the time that I was a young man* (R): (2) it is mostly used governed in the *gen.* by <sup>مِنْ</sup> (IA, A); and therefore does not occur in the *Kur* except with <sup>مِنْ</sup>, as XVIII. 64. and <sup>لِيُنْذِرَ</sup> <sup>بِأَسَا</sup> <sup>شَدِيدًا</sup> and XVIII. 2. *That it may warn them that disbelieve of a grievous chastisement proceeding from Him* (IA): (3) it is *uninfl.* (R, IA, A), according to most of the Arabs (IA), either, as IH says, because some of its

*dial. vars.* are constituted like the *p.* [159], and the rest assimilated to them, otherwise there would be no reason for its uninflectedness, because it is like <sup>أَ</sup>عِنْدَ, which is *infl.* by common consent; or, as I think (R), because it [exceeds the rest of the aplastic *adv.* (64), and (R)] resembles the *p.* [159], in aplasticity, being not only aplastic, [i. e. not excluded from adverbiality, except by being governed in the *gen.* by <sup>أَ</sup>مِنْ (IA),] but also inseparable from the sense of *beginning* (R, IA) of *extent*, and not predicable [see (6) below] (IA): but K̄ais inflect it (R, IA, A), by assimilation to <sup>أَ</sup>عِنْدَ (Sn); and hence the reading [of Abū Bakr on the authority of ‘Āṣim (IA, Sn)] <sup>أَ</sup>مِنْ لَدُنْكَ XVIII. 2. (IA, A) with the ُ quiescent, but made to smack of Ḍamm (IA, Sn); and possibly the saying [of a Ṭā’ī Rājiz (FA)]

تَنْتَهَضُ الرَّعْدَةُ فِي ظَهْرِي \* مِنْ لَدُنِ الظَّهْرِ إِلَى الْعَصِيرِ

(IA) *The shivering fit of ague comes on in my poor back from the time of noon until near the evening* (J): (4) it may be *pre.* to *props.* [below]: (5) it may be aprothetic [in letter and sense (Sn)] before <sup>أَ</sup>غَدُوَّة [below]: (6) it occurs only as a complement [see (3) above]: you say <sup>أَ</sup>السَّفَرُ مِنْ عِنْدِ الْبَصْرَةِ *The journey is from AlBaṣra*, but not <sup>أَ</sup>مِنْ لَدُنِ الْبَصْرَةِ (A). It has 8 *dial. vars.*, <sup>أَ</sup>لَدُنْ, the

original and best known one, <sup>اَ</sup>لُدْنُ, <sup>اَ</sup>لُدْنِ, <sup>اَ</sup>لُدْنِ, <sup>اَ</sup>لُدْ, <sup>اَ</sup>لُدْ, <sup>اَ</sup>لُدْ, and <sup>اَ</sup>لُدْ; but elision of its ن is not allowable when it is *pre.* to a *pron.* (R). Being always *pre.* [115] (IM), <sup>اَ</sup>لُدْنُ governs [what follows it in (R)] the *gen.* (IM, R) by prothesis [110] (R, IA, A), (1) literally, if it be a [single (R) *infl.* (A)] *n.*, [as XXVII. 6. and <sup>اَ</sup>تَنْتَهَضُ <sup>اَ</sup>آخُ (above) (A)]: (2) constructively, if it be (a) a *prop.* (R, A), as

وَتَذْكُرُ نِعْمَةَ لُدْنٍ اَنْتَ يَا فَعٍ

*And thou rememberest his bounty, since thou wast a stripping and صَرِيعٌ غَوَانٍ آخُ; (b) uninfl., as XVIII. 64. and XVIII. 2. (A). But [the word (R)] غُدُوَّةٌ after لُدْنُ may be governed in (1) the *gen.* [by prothesis (A), according to rule (IA, A)]: (2) the *acc.* (R, IA, A), as*

وَمَا زَالَ مَهْرِي مَزَجَرَ الْكَلْبِ مِنْهُمْ  
لُدْنٍ غُدُوَّةٌ حَتَّى دُنْتُ لَغُرُوبِ

(IA, A), by Abū Sufyān [Ṣakhr (AGh)] Ibn Ḥarb (SR) alKuraṣhī alUmawī (AGh), *And my colt ceased not to be as far from them as the rated dog [64], from morning until it (i. e. the sun) was near to setting (J): (a) لُدْنُ is then cut off from prothesis in letter and sense [above] (A); while غُدُوَّةٌ is anomalously governed in the *acc.* (IM, R) by it (IM) as a *sp.* (IA, A), which IM prefers*

(IA), or by assimilation to the [direct (Sn)] *obj.* (A), the reason being that <sup>ا</sup>لَئِنْ is frequently used with <sup>ا</sup>غَدُوَّةٌ, contrary to the rest of the *advs.*, like <sup>ا</sup>بَكْرَةً and <sup>ا</sup>عُشِيَّةً, and that, the <sup>ا</sup> of <sup>ا</sup>لَئِنْ being pronounced with Damm, Fath, and Kasr, as above shown in its *dial. vars.*, and moreover its <sup>ا</sup> being sometimes elided, the vowels of the <sup>ا</sup> resemble the vowels of inflection in respect of their changeability, and the <sup>ا</sup> resembles the Tanwīn in respect of its suppressibility, so that <sup>ا</sup>لَئِنْ <sup>ا</sup>غَدُوَّةٌ becomes like <sup>ا</sup>لَئِنْ <sup>ا</sup>غَدُوَّةٌ [or <sup>ا</sup>ضَارِبٌ <sup>ا</sup>زَيْدًا] in letter, and therefore <sup>ا</sup>غَدُوَّةٌ is governed in the *acc.* by assimilation to the *sp.* in <sup>ا</sup>لَئِنْ <sup>ا</sup>غَدُوَّةٌ [85] or to the *obj.* in <sup>ا</sup>ضَارِبٌ <sup>ا</sup>زَيْدًا [343] (R): (b) some say that <sup>ا</sup>غَدُوَّةٌ is *pred.* of <sup>ا</sup>كَانَ suppressed [with its *sub.* (A)], i. e. <sup>ا</sup>كَانَتْ <sup>ا</sup>السَّاعَةُ <sup>ا</sup>غَدُوَّةً since (*the hour was*) *morning*; [and, according to this construction, <sup>ا</sup>لَئِنْ is *pre.* to the *prop.* (Sn)]: (c) if you couple to <sup>ا</sup>غَدُوَّةٌ [after <sup>ا</sup>لَئِنْ (IA)], the coupled may be in the *gen.* from observance of the general rule, or *acc.* from observance of the letter: Akh mentions that (IA, A), but IM deems the *acc.* improbable (A), because another *n.* than <sup>ا</sup>غَدُوَّةٌ would then be governed in the *acc.* after <sup>ا</sup>لَئِنْ [below] (Sn): (d) <sup>ا</sup>غَدُوَّةٌ after <sup>ا</sup>لَئِنْ is always pronounced with Tanwīn, even if it be *det.* [8], either by assimilation to the *sp.*,



so that it is i. q. <sup>أ</sup>عِنْدِ <sup>مِنْ</sup> ; whereas <sup>أ</sup>لَدَى is i. q. <sup>أ</sup>عِنْدِ (R). <sup>أ</sup>لَدَى is like <sup>أ</sup>عِنْدِ unrestrictedly, except that (1) it cannot be governed in the *gen.* [by the *p.* (Sn)], contrary to <sup>أ</sup>عِنْدِ : (2) <sup>أ</sup>عِنْدِ is more versatile than it in two ways, vid. that (a) <sup>أ</sup>عِنْدِ is an *adv.* for concrete *ns.* and abstract ones, as هَذَا الْقَوْلُ عِنْدِي صَوَابٌ *This saying in my opinion is correct* ; whereas that is impossible with <sup>أ</sup>لَدَى : so says ISh: (b) you say <sup>أ</sup>عِنْدِي مَالٌ [115], even if it be *absent* from you; but not <sup>أ</sup>لَدَى مَالٌ, except when it is *present* : so say H, AHA, and ISh (A). It is [said to be] *uninfl.* upon quiescence (IY) : but there is no proof of its uninflectedness (R) ; and A's saying that it is "like <sup>أ</sup>عِنْدِ unrestrictedly" implies that it is *infl.* (Sn). Its <sup>أ</sup> is [treated like the <sup>أ</sup> of <sup>أ</sup>إِلَى and <sup>أ</sup>عَلَى, being preserved with the explicit *n.*, and (R)] converted into <sup>أ</sup>ي with the *pron.* in the *dial.* of most [129] (R, BS); but S transmits on the authority of Khl from a people of the Arabs <sup>أ</sup>لَدَاك, <sup>أ</sup>إِلَاك, and <sup>أ</sup>عَلَاك, as

طَارُوا عَلَىٰ فِطْرٍ عَلَّاهَا \* وَاشْدُدْ بِمِثْنَيْنِ حَقْبَ حَقْوَاهَا

(R), by Abu-nNajm, *They have fled upon them, then flee thou upon her : and bind her two flanks tight with a double hind-girth* (FA).

§ 206. <sup>الآن</sup> is a *n.* denoting *time present*, (1) *in whole*, as II. 66. [149] ; (2) *in part*, as <sup>فَمَنْ يَسْتَمِعِ الآنَ</sup> LXXII. 9. *For whoso listeneth now* (Sh), i. e. *at the time of the revelation of the text, and afterwards to the end of time* (MAd). It is an *adv. of time*, *uninfl.* upon Fatḥ [201] (IY,IA). Some hold that the <sup>أَلْ</sup> prefixed to it denotes *determination of presence* [599], because <sup>الآن</sup> means *At this time* ; but some, among whom is IM, hold that it is *red.*, and that <sup>الآن</sup> is *uninfl.* because it implies the sense of the *p.* [159], vid. the <sup>ل</sup> of *presence* (IA). What I think is that <sup>الآن</sup> is made *det.* by the <sup>ل</sup> expressed in it, which is inseparable from it, because the *det.* is always meant by it : and that it is *uninfl.* because of its vagueness [171] and applicability to every *time* when it is *present*, but not when it is *past*; and because the *p.* of determination is inseparable from it, so that it follows the course of <sup>الَّذِي</sup> [176] (IY). It is sometimes *infl.*, as in the saying [of Abū Ṣakhr alHudhalī (SM)]

لَسَلَّمِي بِنَاتِ الْبَيْنِ دَارَ عَرَفَتَهَا

وَأُخْرَى بِنَاتِ الْجَيْشِ آيَاتَهَا سَطَرُ

كَانَهُمَا مِلَانِ لَمْ يَتَغَيَّرَا

وَقَدْ مَرَّ لِلدَّارَيْنِ مِنْ بَعْدِنَا عَصْرُ



*Salma had an abode at Dhāt AlBain that I knew, and another at Dhāt AlJaish, whose marks are erased like a line; as though they [the two places, masc. because each is a مَوْضِعٌ] had not been different from now, when an age has passed for the two abodes after our time, orig. مِنَ الْآنَ [660] (Sh). In II. 66. الْآنَ is read (B); and sometimes لَانَ is said (R). As for امْسِ, [when it means a specified (Sh, Fk) day (MAd), vid. the day before your day (Sh, YS), and is not pre., nor synarthrous, nor a{du. or (MAd)} broken pl., nor a dim. (Fk, MAd),] (1) according to the Hijāzīs, it is uninfl. (M, R, Sh, Fk) upon Kasr [201] (M, Sh, Fk), unrestrictedly (Sh, Fk), i. e. in the nom., acc., and gen., with and without Tanwīn (YS), as*

مَنْعُ الْبَقَاءِ تَقْلُبُ الشَّمْسُ \* وَطُلُوعُهَا مِنْ حَيْثُ لَا تَمْسِي

وَطُلُوعُهَا حُمْرًا صَافِيَةً \* وَغُرُوبُهَا صَفْرًا كَالزَّرْدِ

تَجْرِي عَلَى كَيْبِ السَّمَاءِ كَمَا \* يَجْرِي حِمَامُ الْمَوْتِ فِي النَّفْسِ

الْيَوْمَ أَعْلَمَ مَا يَجِيءُ بِهِ \* وَمَضَى بِفَضْلِ قَضَائِهِ امْسِ

(Sh) by Rauḥ Ibn Zimbā' [alJudhāmi (ID, Is)], *The changing of the sun has forbidden remaining (in the world), and its rising from where it enters not upon the evening, and its rising red, clear, and its setting yellow like saffron. It runs its course upon the middle of the sky, as the doom of death runs its course in the living*

*being. To-day I know what it (i. e. to-day) brings, and yesterday has passed by the grace of His (i. e. the Lord's) decree (Jsh):* (a) according to the GG (Fk), it is *uninfl.* because of its implying [the sense of (Fk)] the determinative ل [159] (IY, R, Fk), and becoming *det.* thereby [IY]: for, every day anterior to a day being its *yesterday*, <sup>٨٤</sup>أمس is *orig. indet.*; and afterwards, when the *yesterday* of the speaker's day is meant, the determinative ل denoting *knowledge* is prefixed to it; but is then suppressed and supplied, because the mind of every one that bears <sup>٨٤</sup>أمس free from prothesis immediately flies to the *yesterday* of the speaker's day, so that it becomes *det.*, as <sup>٨٤ ٨٤ ٨٤</sup>لَقَيْتُهُ أَمْسَ الْاَحَدِثِ *I met him on the most recent yesterday* (R): (b) it is *uninfl.* upon a vowel in order that it may be known to be *orig. infl.* [159] (Fk); and [the س (IY)] is pronounced with Kasr, [according to rule (Fk),] because of the concurrence of 2 quiescents [664] (IY, Fk): (c) <sup>٨٤ ٨٤ ٨٤</sup>رَأَيْتُهُ أَمْسَ *I saw him yesterday* has been heard, but is anomalous (KF): (2) according to [most of (Sh, Fk)] Banu Tamim, [as S transmits from them (R),] it is (a) *infl.* as a diptote in the *nom.* [exclusively (Sh, Fk), as

<sup>٨٤ ٨٤ ٨٤</sup>اَعْتَصِم بِالرَّجَاءِ اِنْ عَنِ يَاسٍ \* وَتَنَاسِ الَّذِي تَضْمَنَ اَمْسَ

(YS) *Hold fast to hope if despair obtrude itself; and feign to forget what yesterday contained* (FA)]; (b) *uninfl.* upon Kasr in the *acc.* and *gen.* (R, Sh, Fk), as

in the *dial.* of the Hijāzīs (R), as <sup>أَ عَتَكَفْتُ أَمْسِي</sup> *I stayed*  
*in the mosque yesterday* and <sup>أَ عَجِبْتُ مِنْ أَمْسِي</sup> *I won-*  
*dered at yesterday* (Sh): (a) the reason of the diptote  
declension is regard to the constructive quality of proper  
name [below]; and they prefer diptote declension in the  
*nom.* and uninflectedness in the *acc.* and *gen.*, as they  
prefer uninflectedness in such as <sup>أَ حَضَارِ</sup> and diptote de-  
clension in such as <sup>أَ حَذَامِ</sup> and <sup>أَ قَطَامِ</sup> [194], although all  
are of one *cat.* [193] (R): (3) according to [some of (R,  
Sh, Fk)] the Banū Tamīm, [says S, it is pronounced  
with Fatḥh after <sup>أَ مَنْ</sup>, because, says Sf (R),] it is declined  
as a diptote (M, R, Sh, Fk) unrestrictedly (Sh, Fk),  
i. e. in the *nom.*, *acc.*, and *gen.* (YS): for, [continues Sf,]  
what follows <sup>أَ مَنْ</sup> is put into the *nom.* or *gen.* [203];  
and therefore, since those who put the *nom.* after <sup>أَ مَنْ</sup>  
decline <sup>أَ أَمْسِي</sup> as a diptote, as <sup>أَ مَنْ أَمْسِي</sup>, those who put  
the *gen.* do the same, so that it is assimilated to itself  
(R), as

<sup>أَ لَقِي رَأَيْتَ عَجَبًا مِنْ أَمْسَا \* عَجَائِزًا مِثْلَ السَّعَالِي خَمْسًا</sup>

(M, R, Sh) *Assuredly I have seen a wonder since yester-*  
*day, old hags like witches, five* (AAz); but this, says he,  
is rare, because the *gen.* [of the past] after <sup>أَ مَنْ</sup> is rare  
[510] (R): (a) the cause of the diptote declension is

[the combination of (IY)] deviation (IY, Fk) from <sup>٥٨٤٨٧</sup>الامسى (Fk) with determination (IY), [i. e.] with the quality of proper name [18] (Fk): (b) the difference between deviation [from the *p.* (IY)] and implication [of it (IY)] is that with deviation the *p.* may be expressed, but not with implication (IY, YS), for which reason what deviates is *infl.*, and what implies is *uninfl.*; and thereby is known the secret of the inflectedness of <sup>١٨</sup>سَكَرَ [18] and the uninflectedness of <sup>٨٤</sup>امسى according the Hījāzīs: but some say that deviation is alteration of the *lit.* form of the word while its sense remains, and that implication is the use of it in its original sense with another sense super-added (YS): (c) Z and many of the GG say that <sup>٨٤</sup>امسى is *infl.* according to the Banū Tamīm unrestrictedly, i. e. in all states, being perhaps misled by the verse <sup>٥٨٤٨٧</sup>لَقَدْ رَأَيْتَ الْآخَ [above]; whereas S restricts this saying by the words “some of the Banū Tamīm” and “after <sup>٨٥</sup>مَنْ” (R): (d) Zji is mistaken in asserting upon the authority of this verse, that, according to some of the Arabs, <sup>٨٤</sup>امسى is *uninfl.* upon Fatḥ (R, Sh): (4) according to some of the Arabs, as some relate, it [is held to be *indet.*, and (IY)] is *infl.* as a triptote (IY, R, YS), unrestrictedly (YS), like <sup>٩</sup>غَدَ (R), as <sup>٩</sup>مَضَى <sup>٥٨٤٨٧</sup>امسى بِمَا فِيهِ (R); *Yesterday has passed with what was in it* (IY); but this

is strange (IY, R). S says that, if you name a man <sup>أَمْسَى</sup> according to the *dial.* of AlḤijāz, you make it triptote, like غَاق [200] when used as a name, because every *uninfl.* single term used as a name for a person must be *infl.* as a triptote [191]: and, according to the *dial.* of [most of] the Banū Tamīm also, you make it triptote in the [3] cases, because it must be made triptote in the *acc.* and *gen.*, since it is *uninfl.* upon Kasr according to them ; and, when you make it triptote in the two cases, you must do so in the *nom.* also, since there is no *n.* in the language triptote in the *acc.* and *gen.* and diptote in the *nom.* (R). But, when one of the preceding conditions is wanting (Fk), [i. e.] when <sup>أَمْسَى</sup> (1) is *indet.* (R), [which occurs] when it means *some day or other of the past days* (Sh), as <sup>أَمْسَا</sup> كُلُّ غَدٍ يَصِيرُ <sup>أَمْسَا</sup> Every to-morrow will become a yesterday (R), or (2) is *pre.*, [as <sup>أَمْسَنَا</sup> مَضَى Our yesterday has passed (R, MAd),] or (3) is synarthrous, [as X. 25. (532) (Sh),] or (4) is a [*du.* or (R, MAd) broken (Sh)] *pl.* (R, Sh), as [<sup>أَمْسَانِي</sup> مَضَى Two yesterdays have passed and (MAd)]

مَرَّتْ بِذَا أَوَّلِ مَنْ أَمْسَى \* تَعَيَّسُ فِينَا مَيْسَةَ الْعُرُوسِ

(Sh) She passed by us before days gone by, swaying in her walk with the swaying walk of the bride (MAd), it is *infl.* [as a triptote (Fk)] by common consent (R, Sh,

Fk), because of the removal of the cause of *uninflectedness*, vid. the supply of the **ج** (R): (a) the synarthrous <sup>٨٤</sup>امسى is sometimes *uninfl.* (R, YS), perhaps because the **ج** is construed to be *red.* (R); and, in the verse [of Nuṣaib (MAd)]

فَإِنِّي وَقَفْتُ الْيَوْمَ وَالْأَمْسِ قَبْلَكَ  
بِبَابِكَ حَتَّى كَانَتِ الشَّمْسُ تَغْرِبُ

[*And verily I have stood to-day and yesterday before it at thy door until the sun was near to setting* (MAd)], <sup>٨٤</sup>امسى is related with [Fath as being an *infl. adv.*, and (Sh)] Kasr as being *uninfl.* (Sh, YS): (b) the cause of its inflection in the *du.* and *pl.* is that the **ج** is supplied only because the mind immediately flies to one of the genus on account of its notoriety among its likes ; whereas, when <sup>٨٤</sup>امسى is dualized or pluralized, that specified one no longer remains (R): (c) according to AH (YS), <sup>٨٤</sup>امسى is declared by S [and others (YS)] to have no *dim.* [292] (R, Sh, YS), like <sup>٩</sup>عَد (R, YS); but it is said by Mb, [F, H, and IM (Sh), as likewise by IB (YS),] to have a *dim.* (Sh, YS), in which case it is *infl.*, according to all, as when it is a broken *pl.* (Sh). If, however, [the anarthrous (Fk)] <sup>٨٤</sup>امسى [that means *a specified* (Fk) *day*] be used as an *adv.*, it is *uninfl.* by common consent (Fk, MAd): so in the Audāḥ (Fk), which here follows IB

(YS). قَطًّا [is an *adv.*, which (ML)] denotes *totality of past time*; [and is always used in the sense of <sup>ع</sup>أَبَدًا *ever*, because it is derived from <sup>ق</sup>الْقَطُّ, which means *cutting* (187), as you say <sup>لَا أَفْعَلُهُ أَبَاطًا</sup> لَا أَفْعَلُهُ أَبَاطًا *I shall decidedly not do it*, except that قَطًّا is *uninfl.*, contrary to <sup>أَبَاطًا</sup>أَبَاطًا (R)]. It is (1) peculiar to negation (M, R, ML), as <sup>مَا فَعَلْتُهُ قَطًّا</sup>مَا فَعَلْتُهُ قَطًّا *I have not ever done it* (IY, ML): (2) sometimes used without negation (R, DM), (a) in letter and sense, as <sup>كُنْتُ أَرَاهُ قَطًّا</sup>كُنْتُ أَرَاهُ قَطًّا *I used to see him continually or always*, i. e. <sup>دَائِمًا</sup>دَائِمًا (R), whence the saying of one of the Companions <sup>قَصَرْنَا صَلَاتَهُ</sup>قَصَرْنَا صَلَاتَهُ *We shortened prayer in journeying with the Apostle* (God bless him, and give him peace!) in most of our ever being, i. e. <sup>أَكْثَرَ وَجُودِنَا فِيمَا مَضَى</sup>أَكْثَرَ وَجُودِنَا فِيمَا مَضَى *in most of our existence in the past* (DM); (b) in letter but not sense, as <sup>هَلْ رَأَيْتَ النَّزْبَ قَطًّا</sup>هَلْ رَأَيْتَ النَّزْبَ قَطًّا [144] (R). It is *uninfl.* (R, ML), because, as is said, some of its *dial. vars.* are constituted like *ps.* [159], as will be seen; but rather because it always implies [the sense of the *p.*, vid.] the *J* of *totality* [599], since it includes the *whole of the past* (R); [or] because it implies the sense of <sup>مَنْ</sup>مَنْ [510] and <sup>أَلَى</sup>أَلَى [500], since the sense is [*I have not done it*] since *I was created until now* (ML). It is *uninfl.* [upon a vowel, in order

that two quiescents may not meet together: and (ML)] upon Damm (IY, R, ML), by assimilation to the finals (ML), like <sup>قَبْلُ</sup> and <sup>بَعْدُ</sup> [201] (IY); and sometimes upon Kasr, according to rule [664] (ML). <sup>قَطَا</sup> is the best known of its *dial. vars.* (R, ML); and <sup>قَطَا</sup>, <sup>قَطَا</sup>, [<sup>قَطَا</sup>] (IY, R), and <sup>قَطَا</sup> (R, ML)] occur (M, R, ML). <sup>عَوْضٍ</sup> [or <sup>عَوْضٍ</sup> (M), *orig. a n. denoting {time and (R)} period* (IY, R), is an *adv.*, which (ML)] denotes *totality of future time* (M, R, ML), *i. q.* <sup>أَبَدًا</sup> (R, ML); but is sometimes used to denote *bare time*, not *i. q.* <sup>أَبَدًا</sup>, in which case it is *infl.*, as

وَلَوْلَا نَبْلُ عَوْضٍ فِي خُصَمَاتِي وَأَوْصَالِي  
لَطَاعَنْتُ صُدُورَ الْخَيْلِ طَعْنًا لَيْسَ بِالْأَلَى

[by AlFind azZimmānī, *And, but for a shooting of time in the thick parts of my forearms and my joints, I should have speared the breasts of the horsemen with a spearing not the one falling short* (T)] and <sup>أَفْعَلُ ذَلِكَ</sup> and <sup>أَفْعَلُ ذَلِكَ</sup>, *i. e. I will do that in future* (R). It is (1) peculiar to negation (M, R, ML), and mostly used with the oath (IY, R), as <sup>أَفْعَلُ ذَلِكَ</sup> [600] (M, R): (2) sometimes used with affirmation, and in the sense of the *past*, as



لَوْلَا دُعَايُ عَنْ عَفَاقٍ وَمَشْهُدِي  
هَوَاتٍ بِعَفَاقٍ عَوْضٍ عَنقَاءَ مَغْرِبِ

*And, but for my defending ‘Ifāḳ and mine awe-inspiring aspect, a calamity would have destroyed ‘Ifāḳ before; though here it is negatived in sense, because it is in the correl. of لَوْلَا [574] (R). If pre., it is infl., as لَا أَفْعَلُ*  
*عَوْضُ الْعَائِضِينَ I will not do it ever [below] (IY, ML), i. e.*  
*دَهْرٌ الدَّاهِرِينَ (IY); and, if not pre., it is uninfl. (ML). It is uninfl., [because it implies the sense of the*  
*ل and ج (T)]: (1) upon Damm, [transmitted by the KK (T), because it is cut off from prothesis (IY, R), like قَبْلَ (IY, R, ML) and بَعْدَ (201) (IY, R), as is proved by its being infl. with the post., as عَوْضُ الْعَائِضِينَ*  
*(above), i. e. so long as a period of time remains (R)]; (2) upon Fath (T, IY, R, ML), for the sake of lightness (IY), like أَيْنَ [below] (ML); (3) upon Kasr (R, ML), like أَمْسٍ [above]. لَمَّا is peculiar to the pret.; and requires two props., [the purport of (DM)] the 2nd of which exists upon the existence [of the purport (DM)] of the 1st. It is said to be a p. denoting existence [of its correl. (DM)] because of existence [of its prot. (DM)]; or, says one of them, [vid. S (DM)], a p. denoting necessity [of the 2nd (DM)]. because of necessity (ML) of the 1st*

(DM). According to [IS, however, who is followed by (ML)] F (R, ML), IJ, and many (ML), it is [a *n. used*, like <sup>مَدَّة</sup> *كَلِمَا*, in the same way as a *cond.* word (204) (R),] an *adv.* (IY, R, ML) of *time* (IY), i. q. <sup>حِين</sup> *حِين* (IY, ML), the meaning of which is *vague time* (IY); or, says IM (ML), i. q. <sup>اِنْ</sup> *اِنْ* (R, ML), which is good, because it is peculiar to the *pret.* and to prefixion to the *prop.* (ML), like <sup>اِنْ</sup> *اِنْ* (DM): and it is *uninfl.*, because of its vagueness and need of a *prop.* after it, like <sup>اِنْ</sup> *اِنْ* and <sup>اِنْ</sup> *اِنْ* [159, 201] (IY). IKh refutes the assertors of <sup>اِنْ</sup> *اِنْ* its nominality by the allowability of <sup>لَمَّا اَكْرَمْتَنِي اَمْسِي اَكْرَمْتَك الْيَوْمَ</sup> *لَمَّا اَكْرَمْتَنِي اَمْسِي اَكْرَمْتَك الْيَوْمَ* Since thou honoredst me yesterday, I honored thee to-day, [upon the ground that it is a *p. of dependence*, not adverbial (DM),] because, when it is construed to be an *adv.*, its *op.* is the *correl.*, [so that the sense resolves itself into *I honored thee to-day at the time when thou honoredst me yesterday* (DM),] whereas the *honoring* occurring *to-day* was not in *yesterday*; but the reply is that this is like V. 116 [419], i. e. *If (it prove that) I have said it*, and similarly here, i. e. *When (it proved) to-day (that) thou honoredst me yesterday, I honored thee* (ML). It is followed by a [*v.* (R)] *pret.* (IY, R) in letter and sense or by <sup>لَمَّا</sup> *لَمَّا* (R). And its *correl.* is (1) a *pret. v.*, [by common consent, as <sup>فَلَمَّا نَجَّاهُمْ اِلَى الْبَرِّ اَعْرَضْتُمْ</sup> *فَلَمَّا نَجَّاهُمْ اِلَى الْبَرِّ اَعْرَضْتُمْ* XVII. 69. And, when He hath brought you safe to land, ye

*turn aside* (ML): (2) a nominal *prop.* conjoined with (a) the اِذَا denoting *suddenness of occurrence*, [also by common consent (DM), as فَلَمَّا نَجَّاهُمْ إِلَى الْبَرِّ إِذَا هُمْ يُشْرِكُونَ XXIX. 65. *And, when He hath brought them safe to land, lo, they worship other gods!* (ML), whence IV. 79. (204) (R)]; (b) the ف, [according to IM, as فَلَمَّا نَجَّاهُمْ إِلَى الْبَرِّ فَمِنْهُمْ مُقْتَصِدٌ XXXI. 31. *And, when He hath brought them safe to land, then of them is a hesitater* (ML)]; (3) an *aor.* (R, ML) i. q. the *pret.* (DM), according to IU, as فَلَمَّا ذَهَبَ عَنْ إِبْرَاهِيمَ الرَّوْعُ وَجَاءَتْهُ الْبَشَرَىٰ XI. 77. *And, when the dread had departed from Abraham, and the glad tidings had come unto him, he disputed with the messengers of Us, which is renderable by جَادَلْنَا* (ML): (4) seldom a *pret.* conjoined with the ف (R). A difficult *ex.* of this لَمَّا is the saying of the poet

أَقُولُ لِعَبْدِ اللَّهِ لَمَّا سَقَاؤُنَا  
وَنَحْنُ بِوَادِي عَبْدِ شَمْسٍ وَهَاشِمٍ

[*I say, i. e. said, to 'Abd Allāh, when our bucket fell, while we were in the valley of 'Abd Shams, Look, and watch it* (Jsh)]; for, it is said, "where are its two *vs.*?" : but the reply is that سَقَاؤُنَا is *ag.* of a suppressed *v.* expounded by وَهَاشِمٍ, [which is a *v.* (DM)] i. q. سَقَطَ, [not

part of a personal proper name, and ought to be written with the **ي**, but is written with the **ا** for the sake of the puzzle (DM)]; and that the *correl.* is suppressed, constructively **قُلْتُ**, as is proved by **أَقُولُ**; while **شِم** is an *imp.* from **شَمْتُ الْبَرْقَ** *I looked at [and watched (Jsh)] the lightning*; and the meaning is *When our bucket fell [into the well (DM)], I said to 'Abd Allāh, Look at it (ML).* **لَهُيْ** in their saying **لَهُيْ أَبُوكَ**, i. e. **لِلَّهِ أَبُوكَ**, is akin to the *uninfl. advs.*, because it is *orig. a prep.* and *gen.*, the predicament of which is the same as that of *advs.* [498]. The *prep.* **لِ** is suppressed from frequency of usage, and the determinative **لِ** supplied, so that **لَا أَبُوكَ** remains, as **لَا أَبُوكَ أَمَّكَ الْخ** [508]; and therefore it is *uninfl.*, because it implies [the sense of] the *p.* [159]: and afterwards the **ع** and **لِ** [of **لَا** *orig. لِيْء*] are transposed, the **ا** being made quiescent because of its occurrence in the place of the quiescent **ا**, and the **ا** being restored to its *o. f.* as a **ي** because of the quiescence of the **ع**, according to one of S's two opinions upon **لَا**, vid. that it is from **لَا** *He was hidden or veiled, يَلِيْء*; while the **ي** is then pronounced with Fath, because of the lightness of Fath upon the **ي**; and sometimes the **ي** is elided, so that **لَا أَبُوكَ** is said. **مَعَ** [115], as S appears to say, is *uninfl.*: and is held to be so because it

is constituted like *ps.* [159]; or because it resembles the *p.* in the smallness of its plasticity, since it is always in the *acc.*: but it should rather be decided to be *infl.*, because of the affixion of the Tanwīn in such as كُنَّا مَعًا *We were together*; and of the sign of the *gen.* in such as خَرَجْتُ مِنْ مَعَهُ *I went forth from beside him*, i. e. مِنْ عِنْدِهِ, although the prefixion of مِنْ to it is anomalous. The ا in مَعًا, according to Khl, is a substitute for the Tanwīn [640], since, according to him, مَعَ has no ل in the *o. f.*; but, according to Y and Akh, which is the truth, it is like the ا of قَتَّى, a substitute for the ل [719]; so that مَعَ, according to them, is the reverse of [the *pre. n. in*] أَخُوكَ [16], its ل being restored in the aprothetic state, and elided in prothesis, because its place is supplied by the *post. (R)*. اَيْنَ is [an *adv. of place (IY)*,] (1) *interrog.* [581], as اَيْنَ كُنْتَ *Where wast thou?*; (2) *cond.* [419] (M, R), as

اَيْنَ تُصَرِّفُ بِهَا الْغَدَاةَ تَجِدُنَا \* نَصْرِفُ الْعِيسَى نَحْوَهَا لِلتَّلَانِي

*Wherever thou turnest with her in the early morning thou wilt find us turn the pale yellow camels towards her for meeting (IY).* It is *uninfl.* [159] upon a vowel because of the [combination of (IY)] two quiescents, and upon Fath because of the heaviness of [Damm or (R)]

Kāsr [664] after the <sup>ي</sup> (IY, R). <sup>مَتَى</sup> is [a n. (ML),] (1) interrog., [as <sup>مَتَى</sup> نَصْرُ اللَّهِ II. 210. *When will the help of God be?* (ML)]; (2) cond. (M, R, ML), as <sup>مَتَى</sup> أَنَا أَبْنَى [149] (IY, ML): and in both cases denotes *time* (R). <sup>مَتَى</sup> is also a p. [513], or a n. syn. with <sup>وَسَطًا</sup>, as in <sup>مَتَى</sup> وَضَعْتُهُ <sup>مَتَى</sup> كُمِي <sup>مَتَى</sup> I put it in, or in the middle of, my sleeve, [transmitted by AZ (R),] where it is i. q. <sup>فِي</sup>, [says ISd (ML),] or <sup>وَسَطًا</sup> [say others (ML)]; and similarly in <sup>مَتَى</sup> شَرِبْنِي بِمَاءِ الْبَحْرِ <sup>مَتَى</sup> [503, 513], where it is i. q. <sup>مِنْ</sup>, [say some (ML),] or <sup>وَسَطًا</sup> (R, ML), says ISd (ML). It is *uninfl.* [159] upon quiescence (IY). The red. <sup>مَا</sup> [565] is attached to [the cond. (IY)] <sup>مَتَى</sup> and <sup>أَيَّنَ</sup>, [as IV. 80. (419, 565, 181) and

<sup>مَتَى</sup> مَا يَرِ النَّاسُ الْغَنَى وَجَارًا \* فَقِيرٌ يَقُولُوا عَاجِزٌ وَحَلِيدٌ

*Whenever men see the rich, while his neighbour is poor, they say "Helpless and powerful" (IY)]; and augments them in vagueness. The distinction between <sup>مَتَى</sup> and <sup>أَيَّنَ</sup> [204] is that <sup>مَتَى</sup> denotes *vague time*, and <sup>أَيَّنَ</sup> specified (M), vid. *coming, time*, for which reason <sup>مَتَى</sup> is cond., and <sup>أَيَّنَ</sup> is not; for, if <sup>أَيَّنَ</sup> *If* were put in the place of <sup>أَيَّنَ</sup> in LXXXIV. 1. [23], it would not be good,*

because what is certain to come to pass would be made doubtful [588] (IY). <sup>اَيَّانَ</sup> is [a vague *adv.* of *time* (IY),] (1) i. q. the *interrog.* <sup>مَتَى</sup> (M, R), except that (a) <sup>مَتَى</sup> is more frequently used; (b) <sup>اَيَّانَ</sup> is peculiar to great [and solemn (IY)] matters, as <sup>يَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ السَّاعَةِ</sup> <sup>اَيَّانَ</sup> <sup>مَرَسَاهَا</sup> VII. 186 *They ask thee about the resurrection, when its coming to pass will be* (IY, R) and LI. 12. [445], whereas <sup>نَمَتْ</sup> <sup>اَيَّانَ</sup> is not said; (c) <sup>اَيَّانَ</sup> is peculiar to the *future*, contrary to <sup>مَتَى</sup>, which is used in the *past* and *future*: (2) *cond.* [419], allowed by some of the moderns (R). It is *uninfi.* because of its implying [the sense of] the *interrog.* Hamza: and its final is vocalized because of the concurrence of two quiescents, and pronounced with Fatḥ by alliteration to the *!* or Fatḥa before it, as in <sup>شَتَّانِ</sup> [196] (IY). According to IJ (K on VII. 186., R), <sup>اَيَّانَ</sup> is derived from <sup>اَيَّ</sup> [184] (K, B, R), being <sup>فَعْلَانِ</sup> from it (K), because its sense is <sup>اَيَّ</sup> <sup>وَقْتٍ</sup> *At what time?* (K, B); not from <sup>اَيْنَ</sup>, because [it denotes *time*, while (K)] <sup>اَيْنَ</sup> denotes *place* (K, R); and because <sup>فَعَالٍ</sup> is rare, and <sup>فَعْلَانِ</sup> frequent, among *ns.*: so that, if used as a name, it would be diptote [18]. Kasr of its Hamza is the *dial.* of Sulaim (R), and AsSulamī reads <sup>اَيَّانِ</sup> (K); and An says that Kasr of its <sup>ي</sup> is a *dial.*

var. (R). As for the parsing of *cond.* and *interrog. ns.* and the like [218], (1) if a *prep.* or *pre. n.* be prefixed to them, they are in the place of the *gen.*, as LXXVIII.

1. [181], <sup>صَبِيحَةَ</sup> <sup>أَيِّ</sup> <sup>يَوْمٍ</sup> <sup>سَفَرِكَ</sup> *On the morning of what day will thy journey be?* [111], and <sup>غُلَامٌ</sup> <sup>مِنْ</sup> <sup>جَاؤَكَ</sup> *Whose young man came to thee?*: [and therefore the

saying that *cond.* and *interrog. ns.* are not governed by what precedes them holds good only if what precedes them be not a *prep.* or *pre. n.*; whereas, if it be so, they are governed by it (DM)]: (2) if not, then, (a) if they

be applied to *time*, as <sup>وَمَا</sup> <sup>يَشْعُرُونَ</sup> <sup>أَيَّانَ</sup> <sup>يَبْعَثُونَ</sup> XVI. 21.

22. *Nor know they when they shall be raised, or place, as*

<sup>فَإَيْنَ</sup> <sup>تَذْهَبُونَ</sup> LXXXI. 26. *Then where are ye going?*, or

*accident*, as XXVI. 228. [445], they are governed in the

*acc.* as adverbial or unrestricted *objs.*: (b) if not, then,

(a) if they be followed by an *indet. n.*, as <sup>مَنْ</sup> <sup>أَبٌ</sup> <sup>لَكَ</sup>

*Who is a father to thee?*, they are *inchs.*; and, if by a

*det. n.*, as <sup>مَنْ</sup> <sup>زَيْدٌ</sup> *Who is Zaid?*, they are *enuncs.* or

*inchs.* according to different opinions [24]: but these

two sorts do not occur among *cond. ns.*, [because they

are followed only by *vs.* (DM)]: (b) if not, then, if

they be followed by an *intrans. v.*, they are *inchs.*, as

<sup>مَنْ</sup> <sup>قَامَ</sup> *Who stood?* and <sup>مَنْ</sup> <sup>يَقُمُ</sup> <sup>أَتَمَّ</sup> <sup>مَعَهُ</sup> *Whoever stands,*

*I will stand with him*; and, if they be followed by a

*trans. v.* that befalls [44] them, they are direct *objs.*, as





*Every one of mankind is such that, if he stands, I will stand with him* [27]: but the correct opinion is the 1st; while the sense depends upon the *correl.* only as respects contingency, not as respects enunciativity. The *correl.* of the *cond. n.* governed in the *nom.* by inchoation needs a *cop.*, which is only a *pron.*, (1) mentioned, as فَمَنْ يَكْفُرْ بَعْدَ مِنْكُمْ فَإِنِّي أُعَذِّبُهُ عَذَابًا V. 115. *Then whosoever of you disbelieveth afterwards, verily I will chastise him with a chastisement*; (2) supplied, or replaced by a substitute, as فَمَنْ فَرَضَ فِيهِنَّ الْحَجَّ فَلَا رَفَثَ وَلَا فُسُوقَ وَلَا جِدَالَ فِي الْحَجِّ II. 193. *Then, whoso bindeth himself to undertake the pilgrimage in them, there shall be no lewd conversation and no transgression and no wrangling proceeding (from him) in the pilgrimage, or no wrangling in his pilgrimage, i. e. مِنْهُ or orig. فِي حَجَّةٍ* [599]. and, as for the texts بَلَىٰ مَنْ أَوْفَىٰ بِعَهْدِهِ وَاتَّقَىٰ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُتَّقِينَ III. 70. *Yea, whoso fulfilleth his covenant, and is pious, (God will love him): for verily God loveth the pious* and وَمَنْ يَتَوَلَّ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا فَإِنَّ حِزْبَ اللَّهِ هُمُ الْغَالِبُونَ V. 61. *And whoso taketh God and His Apostle and them that have believed as friends, (shall overcome): for verily the host of God, they are the overcomers* and the verse [of AlKuṭāmī (DM)]

فَمَنْ تَكُنِ الْحَضَارَةُ اعْجَبْتَهُ \* فَإِى رِجَالٍ بَادِيَةٍ تَرَانَا

[Then whoso is such that townsfolk do please him, (we are not of his quality): then what men of a desert dost thou deem us to be? (DM)], the *correl.* in them is suppressed, i. e. <sup>وَصَلَّى</sup> يَحْبِبُهُ اللّٰهُ [in the *apoc.* (DM)], <sup>أَ</sup>يَغْلِبُ, and <sup>أَ</sup>فَلَسْنَا <sup>أَ</sup>عَلَى صَفْتِهِ. The *interrog.* or *cond. reg.* of the *v.* or its like must precede [the *op.* (DM)], as XL. 81. [above], XXVI. 228. [445], and XXVIII. 28. [184]; and for this reason the *pron.* of the case is supplied in <sup>أَ</sup>أَنْ مِّنْ <sup>أَ</sup>يَدْخُلُ [517, 167] (ML). The *op.* of <sup>أَ</sup>مَتَى [204] and every *adv.* containing the sense of *condition* is its *prot.*, as most say; and may not be its *apod.*, as some say, just as the *op.* may not be the *apod.* in the case of non-adverbial [*cond.*] *ns.*, since you do not say <sup>أَ</sup>أَيُّهُمْ <sup>أَ</sup>جَاوَك فَاضْرِبْ with <sup>أَ</sup>أَيُّهُمْ in the *acc.* (R),

§ 207. <sup>أَ</sup>كَيْفَ is a *n.* (IY, ML), not a *p.* or *v.* (IY), because (1) the *prep.* is prefixed to it without paraphrase [20, 468] in their saying <sup>أَ</sup>عَلَى كَيْفَ تَبِيعَ <sup>أَ</sup>الْحَمْرَيْنِ <sup>أَ</sup>[In what state dost thou sell the two red things, i. e. wine and meat? (DM)]; (2) the genuine *n.* is made a *subst.* for it [without paraphrase (DM)], as <sup>أَ</sup>كَيْفَ أَنْتَ أَصْحَبِمْ أَمْ <sup>أَ</sup>سَقِيمٌ [below]; (3) in such as <sup>أَ</sup>كَيْفَ كُنْتُ <sup>أَ</sup>How wast

*thou* ? it is made a *pred.*, which excludes the *p.* [497]; and is contiguous to the *v.*, which excludes the *v.* [593] (ML). It is treated as an *adv.* (M, R) by many, who render it by the *prep.* (IY); because it is i. q. <sup>عَلَى</sup> <sup>أَيِّ</sup> <sup>حَالٍ</sup> *In what state*?, and the *prep.* and *adv.* are akin. That <sup>كَيْفَ</sup> is an *adv.* is the opinion of Akh (R): but [according to S (R)] it is [correctly (IY)] a [plain (IY)] *n.*, [not an *adv.*, though it conveys the sense of <sup>عَلَى</sup> <sup>أَيِّ</sup> <sup>حَالٍ</sup> (IY),] because the *n.* occurs as a *subst.* for it, as <sup>كَيْفَ</sup> <sup>أَنْتَ</sup> <sup>أَصِحَّ</sup> <sup>أَمْ</sup> <sup>سَقِيمٌ</sup> [above] *How art thou, well or ill*?, [and as a reply to it, as <sup>صَحِيحٌ</sup> *Well* or <sup>سَقِيمٌ</sup> *Ill* in reply to <sup>كَيْفَ</sup> <sup>أَنْتَ</sup> *How art thou*? (IY)]; whereas, if it were an *adv.*, the *adv.* would occur as a *subst.* for it (IY, R), and as a reply to it (IY); though Akh may say that the *prep.* and *gen.* may be made a *subst.* for it, as <sup>كَيْفَ</sup> <sup>زَيْدٌ</sup> *How is Zaid*, in the state of health, or in the state of sickness?, [and similarly with the reply]. Thus <sup>كَيْفَ</sup>, according to S, is renderable by <sup>عَلَى</sup> <sup>أَيِّ</sup> <sup>حَالٍ</sup> <sup>حَاصِلٌ</sup> *In what state [art thou] existing*?, but, according to Akh, by <sup>عَلَى</sup> <sup>أَيِّ</sup> <sup>حَالٍ</sup> *In what state*?, <sup>حَاصِلٌ</sup>, according to him, being supplied [26, 498] (R). It is used in two ways, (1) as a *cond.*, in which case it requires two *vs.* agreeing in letter and sense, and not

apocopated, [whether مَا be prefixed to them or not, according to the BB (DM),] as كَيْفَ تَصْنَعُ اصْنَعُ However thou dost, I will do; while كَيْفَ تَجْلِسُ اَنْهَبُ is not allowable by common consent [of the BB and KK (DM)]; nor كَيْفَ تَجْلِسُ اجْلِسُ according to the BB, except Ktb, [who agrees with the KK (DM),] because كَيْفَ differs from the *cond.* instruments [419] in that its *correl.* must agree with its *prot.*, as above stated: but some say that this [apocopation of the two *vs.* by it (DM)] is allowable unrestrictedly, [i. e. whether it be conjoined with مَا or not (DM),] which is the opinion of Ktb and the KK; or upon condition of its being conjoined with مَا, [which opinion is followed by the author of the Aj, since he says “ { The apocopatives are كَمْ, ..... (Aj), } and كَيْفًا ” (DM)]: (a) they say that يَنْفِقُ كَيْفَ يَشَاءُ V. 69. *He dispenseth His bounty howsoever He willeth* and اَلَّذِي يَصُوْرُكُمْ فِي الْاَرْحَامِ كَيْفَ يَشَاءُ III. 4. *He that fashioneth you in the wombs howsoever He willeth* are instances of its occurrence as *cond.*, its *correl.* being suppressed because indicated by what precedes it, [i. e. كَيْفَ يَصُوْرُكُمْ يَشَاءُ and كَيْفَ يَشَاءُ يَنْفِقُ (DM)]; but this is dubious according to their unrestricted declaration that its *correl.* must resemble its *prot.*, [whether the *correl.* be mentioned or suppressed (DM)]: (2) as an *interrog.*,

which is mostly the case, either real, as كَيْفَ زَيْدٌ [above]; or otherwise, as II. 26. [80], where it is used in the sense of *wonder*: (a) it [i. e. the *interrog.* (DM)] occurs (a) as an *enunc.* or *pred.* before what is not independent [of an *enunc.* real or annulled (DM)], as كَيْفَ ظَنَنْتَ زَيْدًا and كَيْفَ كُنْتَ ; and hence كَيْفَ أَعْلَمْتَهُ فَرَسَكَ How thoughtest thou Zaid to be? and كَيْفَ أَعْلَمْتَهُ فَرَسَكَ How madest thou him to know thy horse to be?, because the 2nd *obj.* of ظَنَّ and the 3rd of أَعْلَمَ are *orig. enuncs.* [440, 434]: (b) as a *d. s.* before what is independent [of an *enunc.* (DM)], as كَيْفَ جَاءَ زَيْدٌ How [74], i. e. *In what state, came Zaid?*; and, in my opinion, as an *unrestricted obj.* also in this sort, whence أَلَمْ تَرَ كَيْفَ فَعَلَ ألم تَرَ كَيْفَ فَعَلَ, LXXXIX. 5. *Hast thou not seen how, i. e. with what dealing, thy Lord dealt with 'Ad?*, since the sense is كَيْفَ فَعَلَ أَيْ فَعَلَ فَعَلَ, and similarly كَيْفَ أَمَرَ كُلِّ أُمَّةٍ مِنْهُمْ لِمَنْ هُمْ رَافِعُونَ IV. 45. *Then how (will they do) when We bring from every people a witness?*, its *op.* يَصْنَعُونَ being supplied between كَيْفَ and إِذَا: (b) كَيْفَ with what follows it in لَقَدْ يَنْظُرُونَ إِلَى الْإِبِلِ كَيْفَ خُلِقَتْ LXXXVIII. 17. *What! then will they not look at the camels, how they have been created?* is a *subst.* of implication for الْإِبِلِ, the

sense being <sup>أَلَى</sup> <sup>الْأَبَلِ</sup> <sup>كَيْفِيَّةً</sup> <sup>خُلِقَهَا</sup> *at the camels, the mode of their creation*; and similar are XXV. 47. [581] and <sup>أَلَى</sup> <sup>اللَّهِ</sup> <sup>أَشْكُو</sup> <sup>الْأَخ</sup> [1], i. e. <sup>تَعَذَّرَ</sup> <sup>التَّقَاتِيَهُمَا</sup> *the impossibility of their meeting together* (ML), <sup>كَيْفَ</sup> being expounded by <sup>تَعَذَّرَ</sup> as an indication that the interrogation here denotes *deeming improbable* (DM): (c) *preps.* are not prefixed to it, as they are to <sup>أَيْنَ</sup> when you say <sup>مِنْ</sup> <sup>أَيْنَ</sup> *From where?* and <sup>أَيْنَ</sup> <sup>أَلَى</sup> *To where?*, because <sup>أَيْنَ</sup> is a question as to *places*, to which *preps.* are prefixed, as <sup>مِنْ</sup> <sup>السُّوقِ</sup> *From the market* and <sup>أَلَى</sup> <sup>السُّوقِ</sup> *To the market*; whereas <sup>كَيْفَ</sup> is a question as to *states*, to which *preps.* are not prefixed, for you do not say <sup>أَمِنْ</sup> <sup>صَحِيحٍ</sup> or <sup>أَمِنْ</sup> <sup>سَقِيمٍ</sup> (IY): but Ktb transmits from some of the Arabs <sup>أَنْظُرْ</sup> <sup>أَلَى</sup> <sup>كَيْفَ</sup> <sup>يَصْنَعُ</sup> *Look how he does* (M), and they say <sup>عَلَى</sup> <sup>كَيْفَ</sup> <sup>تُبِيعَ</sup> <sup>الْأَحْمَرِيِّ</sup> [above], which are anomalous: (d) its reply is only *indet.*, as <sup>صَالِحٌ</sup>, not <sup>الصَّالِحُ</sup>, in reply to <sup>كَيْفَ</sup> <sup>زَيْنَ</sup> (IY). Many assert that <sup>كَيْفَ</sup> occurs as a copulative [*p.* (DM)]; and among them is IIM, who cites as an instance of it

إِذَا قُلَّ مَالُ الْمَرْءِ لَأَنْتَ قَنَاتُهُ

وَهَآنَ عَلَى الْإِدْنَى فَكَيْفَ الْإِبَاعِدُ

(ML) *When the wealth of the man becomes small, his spear-shaft becomes soft, and he is lowered before the nearest kinsman, and the farthest ones, the ف being apparently red.* (DM). It is *uninfl.* because it occurs in the place, and implies the sense, of the *interrog.* [159]; and the ف is mobilized to avoid the concurrence of quiescents, and pronounced with Fath because Kasra [664] is deemed heavy after the ي (IY). And كى is said for كَيْفَ (IY, R, ML), like سُو for سَوْفَ [578] (IY, ML), as

كَيْ تَجْزَعُونَ إِلَى سَامٍ وَمَا تُثْبِرْتُمْ  
قَتْلَكُمْ وَلَطَى الْهَيْجَاءُ تَضْطَرُّمُ

(ML) *How incline ye to peace, when your slain have not been avenged, and the flame of war is blazing?* (FA, Jsh): and, [according to An (R),] this is a *dial. var.*; but some say that the ف is elided [for alleviation (IY) by poetic license (R)]. اَنِى is [an *adv. of place* (IY),] (1) *interrog.*, [as اَنِى لَبْ هَذَا III. 32. *Whence hast thou this?* (IY)]; (2) *cond.*, as

فَاَصْبَحْتَ اَنِى تَاتِيهَا تَشْتَجِرُ بِهَا  
كَلَّا مَرْكَبِيهَا تَحْتَ رَجْلَيْكَ شَاجِرُ

[by Labrid (IY), *Then thou hast become such that, whencesoever thou comest to it* (meaning calamity, which



he compares to a *restive beast*), *thou art embarrassed with it: each of its two seats (before and behind) between thy two legs is unsteady* (AAz): and has [three senses, whether it be *interrog.* or *cond.*, vid. (R)] the sense of (1) <sup>أَيْنَ</sup> [except that it is used with <sup>مِنْ</sup>, (a) expressed, as

مِنْ أَيْنَ عِشْرُونَ لَنَا مِنْ أُنَى

{*From where have we twenty (camels or sheep), from where?* (Jsh)}; (b) supplied (R),] as III. 32., [i. e. <sup>مِنْ أَيْنَ</sup> (R),] meaning <sup>مِنْ أَيْنَ</sup> : (2) كَيْفَ (IY, R), according to some (IY), as <sup>ثُمَّ اَنْظُرْ اُنَى يُوْفِكُوْنَ</sup> V. 79. *Then behold how they are perverted* (R), whence II. 223 [below] and

اُنَى وَمِنْ اَيْنَ اَبَكَ الطَّرَبُ \* مِنْ حَيْثُ لَا صَبُورَةٌ وَلَا رَيْبُ

(IY), by AlKumait, *How, and whence, has mirth returned to thee, since there are no youthful folly and no scandals?* (AAz): (3) مَتَى; while the text <sup>فَاتُوا حَرْثَكُمْ اُنَى</sup> II. 223. *Then come to your husbandry* [1] *whence-soever, or howsoever* [above], or *whensoever*, ye will is interpreted in all 3 ways. But it does not occur in the sense of كَيْفَ or مَتَى unless it be followed by a *v.* (R). It is *uninfl.* because it implies [the sense of (AAz)] the *interrog.* Hamza [or *cond. p.* (AAz)]; and its final is quiescent according to rule [159] (IY).

## THE COMPOUNDS.

§ 208. The *comp.* is every [single (R)] *n.* [resulting (R, Jm)] from [the composition of (R, Jm)] two words, [real or predicamental (Jm), both *ns.*, *vs.*, or *ps.*, or *n.* and *v.*, *n.* and *p.*, or *v.* and *p.* (R, Jm),] between which there is no relation (IH) at all, either at present or before the composition. We say “real or predicamental” in order to include such as <sup>سَيِّبُ</sup> [4], because its last member, being a sound not applied to denote a meaning, is not a word [1], but is in the predicament of a word, since it is treated as an *uninfl. n.*; and IH says “between which there is no relation” in order to exclude such as <sup>عَبْدُ اللَّهِ</sup> and <sup>تَابِعُ شَرًّا</sup> [4], because between the two members of each of them there is a relation [explained below] before the whole becomes a proper name (Jm). But this definition excludes part of the defined, [vid. the *comp.* in which a *con.* is supplied (R),] as <sup>خُمْسَةُ عَشَرَ</sup> [210], [or a *prep.*, as <sup>بَيْتُ بَيْتٍ</sup> (211) (R)]; because between its two members there is [some relation, vid. (R)] the relation of coupling (R, Jm) or something else (R): and it is best to say that by “relation” is meant relation comprehensible from the *external form* of the composition, like the relation of prothesis [110] in <sup>عَبْدُ اللَّهِ</sup>, and of dependence [44] in <sup>تَابِعُ شَرًّا</sup>; whereas in <sup>خُمْسَةُ عَشَرَ</sup>

[210] the *form* of the composition does not indicate any relation at all (Jm). The *comps.* are of two kinds, (1) a kind whose composition requires the two *ns.* to be *uninfl.* together, as حَيْضٌ بَيْضٌ together with its unit [210], etc. [211], and الْخَزَارِ بَارِ [212]; (2) a kind whose composition requires only the 1st of them to be *uninfl.*, as بَادِي بَدِي [213], أَيَدِي سَبَا [214], and مُعْدِيكَرِبٌ [215] (M). Z puts بَادِي بَدِي or بَادِي بَدَا and أَيَدِي سَبَا [215] in the *cat.* of مُعْدِيكَرِبٌ ; but S puts them in the *cat.* of خَمْسَةُ عَشَرَ, which is more probable, though it be only by way of assimilation, not because the 2nd implies [the sense of] a *p.* [209]: for, if the matter were as Z says, بَدِي and بَدَا would necessarily be declined as triptotes by affixion of Tanwin to them, because they contain composition only, without the quality of proper name [18], whereas they have not been heard pronounced with Tanwīn; and similarly سَبَا would necessarily be pronounced with Tanwīn, because it is here the name of a *man*, not of a *tribe*, as it is interpreted in XXVII. 22. [18] (R).

§ 209. The distinction between the two kinds is that (M), if the 2nd [member (Jm)] imply [the sense of (IY)] a [*con.* or other (Jm)] *p.*, both [members (M, Jm)] are *uninfl.*, [as أَحَدٌ عَشَرَ (210) and حَيْضٌ بَيْضٌ (211)]

(IY), because the cause of uninflectedness exists in each of them, since the 1st {*n.* (IY)} becomes {through the composition like part of a *n.*, being (IY)} in the same position as the beginning of a word towards its end, while the 2nd implies the sense of the *p.* (M)]; but, if not, the 2nd is *infl.*, and the 1st *uninfl.* (M, IH), in the correctest (IH) *dial.* (Jm), as مَعْدِيكَرَب [215] (IY).

§ 210. The *v. f.* of the *num.* exceeding 10 is that the 2nd should be coupled to the 1st, as ثَلَاثَةٌ وَعِشْرُونَ; then the two *ns.* [the unit and the decimal (IY)] are amalgamated into one, and are *uninfl.* [211, 318] because of the existence of the two causes [209]. Some of the Arabs make the ع quiescent, saying أَحَدٌ عَشْرٌ [and ثَلَاثَةٌ عَشْرٌ (IY)] to guard against the succession of [6 or 5 (IY)] mobiles in one word, [not more than 4 mobiles being combined in one word: but this is not done in اثْنَا عَشْرَ (318), because two quiescents would then be combined; and because, the ا and ي being quiescent, there is not the same succession of mobiles in these two words as there is in أَحَدٌ عَشْرٌ and the like; and because they are not compounded, so that they are not one word (IY)]. The determinative *p.* and prothesis do not spoil the uninflectedness [of this *num.* (IY)]: you say (1) الْوَاحِدُ The eleven and الْعَاصِي عَشْرَ The eleventh [324] to الْتِسْعَةَ عَشْرَ The nineteen and الْتَّاسِعَ عَشْرَ The nineteenth;

(2) <sup>أَحَدٌ</sup> <sup>عَشْرٌ</sup> *Thy eleven* and <sup>تِسْعَةٌ</sup> <sup>عَشْرٌ</sup> *Thy nineteen* [and <sup>خَامِسٌ</sup> <sup>عَشْرٌ</sup> *Thy fifteenth* (IY)]: but Akh used to approve the *nom.* when he prefixed it, [as <sup>خَمْسَةٌ</sup> <sup>عَشْرٌ</sup> *Thy fifteen* (IY),] which S deemed corrupt. And, if <sup>خَمْسَةٌ</sup> <sup>عَشْرٌ</sup> [or the like *comp.* (IY)] be used as a name for a man, it may (1) be [*infl.*, pronounced with Damm of the <sup>ر</sup> (IY)] in the *nom.*, [and Fath in the *acc.* and *gen.*, being declined as a diptote, like <sup>بَعْلَبَك</sup> (215), because of the removal of the sense of coupling; and, according to this, when you prefix, you decline it as a triptote (17), as <sup>خَمْسَةٌ</sup> <sup>عَشْرٌ</sup> (IY)]: (2) remain [*uninfl.* (IY),] pronounced with Fath (M), because you imitate its state before it was used as a name (IY).

§ 211. The following synthetic *comps.* are *uninfl.* upon Fath, (1) *nums.* [210]: (2) *advs.*, (a) temporal, as (a) <sup>فُلَانٌ</sup> <sup>يَأْتِينَا</sup> <sup>صَبَاحٌ</sup> <sup>مَسَاءً</sup> *Such a one comes to us, morning (and) evening*, orig. <sup>صَبَاحًا</sup> <sup>وَمَسَاءً</sup>, i. e. (*every morning and evening*, the *con.* being suppressed, and the two *advs.* compounded together for the sake of abbreviation in the same way as <sup>خَمْسَةٌ</sup> <sup>عَشْرٌ</sup>, whence

وَمَنْ لَا يَصْرِفُ الرَّاشِينَ عَنْهُ \* صَبَاحٌ مَسَاءً يَبْغُو خَبَالًا

[And whoso turns not the slanderers away from himself morning and evening, they will seek insanity for him

(MAd)]; but, if you prefixed, saying <sup>صَبَاحٌ مَسَاءٌ</sup>, it would be allowable, i. e. *on a morning possessed of*, [i. e. *succeeded by* (MAd),] *an evening*, like <sup>لَمْ يَلْبَثُوا إِلَّا عَشِيَّةً أَوْ</sup>  
<sup>فُلَانٌ يَأْتِينَا يَوْمٌ يَوْمٌ</sup> LXXIX. 46. *Had not tarried in the graves save an afternoon or its forenoon*: (b) <sup>فُلَانٌ يَأْتِينَا يَوْمٌ يَوْمٌ</sup>  
*Such a one comes to us day by day*, orig. <sup>يَوْمًا فَيَوْمًا</sup>, i. e. *every day*, whence

<sup>أَتِ الرِّزْقُ يَوْمٌ يَوْمٌ فَاجْمَلْ \* طَلِبَا وَابْغِ لِلْقِيَامَةِ زَادًا</sup>  
 [Subsistence will come day by day: then moderate desire, and seek provision for the day of resurrection (MAd)]:  
 (b) local, as <sup>سَهَّلْتُ الْهَمْزَةَ بَيْنَ بَيْنِ</sup> *I softened the Hamza betwixt and between* [658], orig. <sup>بَيْنَهَا وَبَيْنَ حَرْفٍ حَرَكْتَهَا</sup>, [158] *the consonant of its vowel*, what is *post.* to the 1st and 2nd <sup>بَيْنِ</sup> being suppressed, the *con.* also suppressed, and the two *advs.* compounded together, whence

<sup>نَحْمِي حَقِيقَتَنَا وَبَعْدُ الْقَوْمِ يَسْقُطُ بَيْنَ بَيْنَا</sup>  
 [by 'Abīd Ibn AlAbras, addressing Imra alKais, *We defend our right, when some of the people fall betwixt and between* (AAz)], orig. <sup>بَيْنِ هَؤُلَاءِ وَبَيْنِ هَؤُلَاءِ</sup> *Between these and those*, [i. e. *between the high and the low* (D)], these two *advs.*, which have become one, being in the position of an *acc.* as [an *adv.* depending upon (MAd)]

a [suppressed (MAd)] *d. s.* [below], since the meaning is  
 فَلَانُ جَارِي بَيْتَ [مُسْتَقَرًّا] (MAd): (?) *ds. s.*, as (a) بَيْتَ  
 بَيْتَ Such a one is my neighbour, tent (to) tent, orig.  
 مُلَاصِقًا [مُنْضَمًا] (MAd) بَيْتًا tent joined to tent, i. e. مَلَاصِقًا  
 adjoining, the *prep.* ل being suppressed, and the two  
 ns. compounded together; though the supplied *prep.*  
 may be إِلَى, [i. e. بَيْتًا مُنْضَمًا إِلَى بَيْتَ (MAd)]; or no  
*prep.* at all may be supplied, but the *con.* ف, [i. e.  
 تَسَاقَطُوا أَحْوَلَ أَحْوَلَ بَيْتًا فَبَيْتًا tent (and) tent (MAd)]: (b)  
 تَسَاقَطُوا أَحْوَلَ أَحْوَلَ مَتَفَرِّقِينَ, They fell one after another, scattered about, i. e. مَتَفَرِّقِينَ,  
 whence the verse of the poet, describing a bull goring  
 dogs,

تَسَاقَطَ عَنْهُ رَوْدَعٌ ضَارِيَاتُهَا \* سَقَاطُ شَرَارِ الْقَيْنِ أَحْوَلَ أَحْوَلَ

[Their bitches trained to hunting dropped off him, off  
 his horn, one after another, as the sparks of the blacksmith  
 are dropped, scattered about (MAd)]: (a) the difference  
 between this sort and the verse cited in the preceding  
 sort is that there the *comp.* depends upon a suppressed  
 اِسْتَقَرَّارٌ, which is the *d. s.* [above], whereas here the  
*comp.* itself is the *d. s.*: (b) if you exclude any of these  
*adv.* or *ds. s.* from the quality of *adv.* or *d. s.*, prothesis  
 is necessary, and composition is disallowed, as هَذِهِ هَمْزَةٌ  
 فَلَانُ يَأْتِينَا كُلَّ صَبَاحٍ مَسَاءً and بَيْنَ بَيْنَ, whence

وَلَوْلَا يَوْمٌ يَوْمٌ مَا آرَدْنَا \* جَزَاكَ وَالْقُرُوضُ لَهَا جَزَاءٌ

[And, but for a day succeeded by a day, we should not have wished thy repayment; though for debts there is repayment (MAd)]: (c) *comp. advs.* and *ds. s.* do not occur in the Revelation, but only *comp. nums.*, as XII.

4. [442], ثَانِي عَشْرَةَ عَيْنًا II. 57. Then twelve springs gushed out from it, and LXXIV. 30.

[87]: (d) *comp. ds. s.* occur rarely in comparison with

*comp. advs.* (Sh). They say (1) تَفَرَّقُوا شَجَرَ بَغْرٍ [or شَجَرَ بَغْرٍ (KF)], i. e. They separated in every direction, without

collecting together; (2) similarly شَذَرَ مَذْرٍ [or شَذَرَ مَذْرٍ (H, KF)] or شَذَرَ بَذْرٍ, all meaning separation without

collecting together; (3) in the same sense خَذَعَ مَذْعٍ; (4)

تَرَكُوا أَلْبَانَ حَيْثُ حَيْثُ They left the countries, dispersing

abroad [or حَيْثُ حَيْثُ (KF)] or حَاتٍ بَاتٍ or حَوْتُ بَوْتُ

or حَيْثُ حَيْثُ [or حَوْتُ بَوْتُ (KF)], with Tanwin by assi-

milation to the *indet. ejs.* [198], when they separate and disperse (IY): the two *ns.* are in the place of an *acc.* as

a *d. s.* (H); and the *o. f.* is شَجَرًا وَبَغْرًا and مَذْرًا

and حَيْثًا وَبَيْثًا and خَذَعًا وَمَذْعًا (M). The [synthetic

(MAd)] composition mentioned occurs also in what is

not an *adv.* or *d. s.*, as وَقَعُوا فِي حَيْصٍ بَيْصٍ, i. e. They

fell into a difficulty hard to escape from; but this is



anomalous (Sh). The *o. f.* is <sup>اَ</sup>وَقَعُوا فِي حَيْصٍ وَبَيْصٍ (M), the *و* being then suppressed for abbreviation, while the sense is copulative; so that <sup>اَ</sup>حَيْصٍ <sup>اَ</sup>بَيْصٍ implies the sense of the *con.*, and is therefore *uninfl.*, like <sup>اَ</sup>خَمْسَةٌ <sup>اَ</sup>عَشْرٌ and its *cat.* [210] (IY). They say (1) <sup>اَ</sup>حَيْصٍ <sup>اَ</sup>بَيْصٍ, [which is the frequent and well-known *dial. var.*, as in the verse of Umayya Ibn Abi 'Ā'idh alHudhali cited by As

قَدْ كُنْتُ خَرَجًا وَلَوْجًا صَيْرًا

لَمْ تَلْتَحِصْنِي حَيْصٍ بَيْصٍ لِحَاصٍ

(IY) *I have been wont to go out, and come in, versatile: adversity has not stuck to me inextricably, حَيْصٍ بَيْصٍ being here in the position of an acc. as a d. s., i. e. in this state of حَيْصٍ بَيْصٍ (DH)]; (2) حَيْصٍ بَيْصٍ (DH, IY, KF); (3) حَيْصٍ بَيْصٍ (KF); (4) حَيْصٍ بَيْصٍ (IY); (5) حَيْصٍ بَيْصٍ (IY, KF); (6) حَيْصٍ بَيْصٍ ; حَيْصًا بَيْصًا*

§ 212. <sup>اَ</sup>الْخَازِ <sup>اَ</sup>بَازٍ is compounded of the *act. parts.* of <sup>اَ</sup>خَازَ overcame and <sup>اَ</sup>بَازَ exalted himself, as though <sup>اَ</sup>هُوَ <sup>اَ</sup>الْبَازِى <sup>اَ</sup>وَالْخَازِى were said (R). It has (1) 7 *dials. vars.* (a) <sup>اَ</sup>خَازَ <sup>اَ</sup>بَازَ; (b) <sup>اَ</sup>خَازَ <sup>اَ</sup>بَازَ; (c) <sup>اَ</sup>خَازَ <sup>اَ</sup>بَازَ; (d) <sup>اَ</sup>خَازَ <sup>اَ</sup>بَازَ; (e) <sup>اَ</sup>خَازَ <sup>اَ</sup>بَازَ; (f) <sup>اَ</sup>خَازَ <sup>اَ</sup>بَازَ, like <sup>اَ</sup>قَاعَاءَ [391]; (g) <sup>اَ</sup>خَازَ <sup>اَ</sup>بَازَ, like <sup>اَ</sup>قِرطَاسٍ [396]:

(2) 5 meanings [transmitted by Sf (IY)], (a) a *kind of herbage*, [as in the saying {of the Rājiz (AAz) cited by IAr (IY)}]

رَعَيْتَهَا أَكْرَمَ عَوْدٍ عَوْدًا \* الصِّلَ وَالصِّفْصِلَ وَالْيَعْضِيدَ

وَالْخَاخَ بَازٍ السِّنِّمَ الْمَجُودَ \* بِحَيْثُ يَدْعُو عَامِرٌ مَسْعُودًا

(M) *I have pastured them upon a most noble branch as a branch, the plants named صِّل and صِفْصِل and the herb named يَعْضِيد and the tall flowering herbage named خَاخٍ بَازٍ watered with rain, so that 'Amir calls Mas'ūd (these being two pastors) to rejoice at the abundance of herbage (IY)]; (b) a [blue (IY)] fly that is in herbage, [as says the poet {'Amr (AAz) Ibn Aḥmar (IY, AAz)}]*

تَفَقَّ فَرْقَةُ الْقَلْعِ السَّوَارِي \* وَجَى الْخَاخُ بَازٍ بِهِ جُنُونًا

(M) *The masses of cloud coming by night burst with water above it {i. e. the low ground or the herbage (IY)}, and the fly named خَاخٍ بَازٍ buzzed loudly in it (IY, AAz)]; (c) [an imitation of (IY)] the sound of the fly, [says As (IY)]; (d) a disease in the [necks and (IY)] jawbones projecting under the ears, [as in the saying {of the Rājiz (IY, AAz), vid. Al'Adawī (IY),}*

يَا خَاخَ بَازٍ أَرْسِلِ اللَّهَازِمَا \* إِنِّي أَخَافُ أَنْ تَكُونَ لَزِمًا

(M) *O disease named خَاخٍ بَازٍ, release the jawbones projecting under the ears: verily I fear that thou mayst*

become *chronic* (AAz)]; (e) the *cat.* (M, R), which is the strangest of them (IY).

§ 213. The *o. f.* of اَفْعَلْ هَذَا بِأَيِّ بَدَى Do this first of every thing or بِأَيِّ بَدَى, [i. e. اَوَّلَ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ (IY),] is بِأَيِّ بَدَى [upon the measure of فَعِيلٍ (IY)] or بِدَأَوْ [upon the measure of فَعَالٍ (IY)], which is then lightened by rejecting the Hamza [of بِدَى or بِدَأَوْ (IY)] and [converting the Hamza of بِأَيِّ into a pure ي, and (IY)] making [it (IY)] quiescent. It [consists of two *ns.* compounded together and *uninfl.* (210); and (IY)] is [*indet.* (IY),] governed in the *acc.* as a *d. s.*, i. e. مَبْتَدَأًا بِهِ قَبْلَ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ beginning with it before every thing. [They say also بِدَى بَدَى with prothesis, without uninflectedness (IY):] and it is sometimes used pronounced with Hamza [in the 2nd, not the 1st, as بِدَى بَدَى or بِدَى; or in both, as بِدَى بَدَى (IY)], whence the tradition of Zaid Ibn Thābit رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ أَمَّا بِأَيِّ بَدَى فَأَنِي أَحْمَدُ اللَّهَ As for the first of every thing, verily I praise God.

§ 214. They say نَهَبُوا أَيْدِي سَبَا They went away (like) the children of Saba or أَيَادِي سَبَا [549], i. e. (like) the children of Saba' Ibn Yashjub [Ibn Ya'rub Ibn Kaḥṭān (IY)] in their separation and dispersion in the

countries when the Flood of the Dams was sent against them, <sup>أَيْدٍ</sup> being a *met.* for *children* and *kindred*. [It has 2 *dial. vars.*: (1) the 2 *ns.* are compounded into one, and *uninfl.* (210); (2) the 1st is *pre.* to the 2nd, as in <sup>صَبَاحَ مَسَاءٍ</sup> (211). It is in the position of an *acc.* as a *d. s.*, i. e. <sup>مُتَفَرِّقَيْنِ</sup> and <sup>مُتَبَدِّلَيْنِ</sup> and the like. And the Hamza of <sup>سَبَا</sup> is omitted for abbreviation, because of the length of the *n.* and the frequency of usage, together with the heaviness of the Hamza (IY)].

§ 215. <sup>مَعْدِيكَرِبٌ</sup> has 2 *dial. vars.*:—(1) composition and diptote declension [of the 2nd, the 1st being *uninfl.* (209), because it occupies the position of part of a word (IY)], as <sup>هَذَا مَعْدِيكَرِبٌ</sup> *This is Ma'dzikarib* [18]: (2) prefixion, the *post.* being declined as (a) a triptote, as <sup>هَذَا مَعْدِي كَرِبٌ</sup>; (b) a diptote, as <sup>هَذَا مَعْدِي كَرِبٌ</sup> [below]. And similar are <sup>قَالِي قَلَا</sup> [below], <sup>حَضْرَمَوْتُ</sup> [4], <sup>بُعْلَبِكُ</sup>, and their likes (M). When <sup>مَعْدِي</sup> is *pre.*, its *ي* is not pronounced with Fath in the *acc.* [16], so that you do not say <sup>رَأَيْتُ مَعْدِي كَرِبٌ</sup>, as you say <sup>قَاضِي وَاسِطٍ</sup> *The judge of Wāsit*, because, being made quiescent in the state of composition, as <sup>هَذَا مَعْدِيكَرِبٌ</sup>, which is a position where the sound [letter] is pronounced

with Fath, as <sup>حُضْرُمُوتُ</sup>, it is made quiescent in the state of inflection also. In <sup>كُرْبُ مَعْدِي</sup> you hold <sup>كُرْبُ</sup> to be a *masc.* [proper] name, and therefore decline it as a triptote [18]. But in <sup>كُرْبُ مَعْدِي</sup> [above], with Fath in every case, there are 2 alternatives:—(1) <sup>مَعْدِي</sup> may be *pre.* to <sup>كُرْبُ</sup>, the latter being held to be a *fem.* proper name, and therefore diptote [18]; and, according to this, both *ns.* are *infl.*: (2) they may be compounded and *uninfl.*, like <sup>خُمْسَةُ عَشْرَ</sup>, as though the 2 *ns.*, before being used as a [proper] name, had been compounded and *uninfl.*, upon the ground that the و was meant to be understood, and then they were used as a name after the composition (IY). S reckons <sup>قَالِي قَلَا</sup> among the sisters of <sup>أَيْدِي سَبَا</sup> [208]: but Z reckons it among the sisters of <sup>مَعْدِي كُرْبُ</sup>; and it contains no evidence to support the opinion of S, because the aggregate of the two words is the proper name of a city [in Armenia (MI)], so that it may be diptote because of the composition and quality of proper name [18], but is not *uninfl.* (R).

## THE UNINFLECTED METONYMS.

§ 216. Metonymy in classical and conventional language is denoting a particular thing, whether it be an expression or a meaning, by an expression not plainly indicative of it, (1) for the sake of perplexing some of the hearers, as in your saying *فَلَانٌ جَاءَنِي* *Such a one came to me*, when you mean *Zaid*; (2) because of the unseemliness of the thing expressed, like *هِيَ* for the *vulva* or *foul act* [14]; (3) for the sake of abridgment, like the *prons.* relating to a preceding expression [160]; (4) for a sort of elegance, like *كَثِيرُ الرَّمَادِ* *Plentiful in ashes* for *كَثِيرُ الْقَرَى* *Plentiful in hospitality*; (5) for some other object. If the thing denoted by the *met.* be an expression, what is intended is (1) the meaning of that expression, as in

كَانَ فَعَالَةً لَمْ تَمَلَّأْ مَوَاطِنَهَا \* دِيَارَ بَكْرٍ وَلَمْ تَخْلَعْ وَلَمْ تَهَبْ

[by AlMutanabbī, lamenting the eldest sister of Saif adDaula, *It is as though the cavalcades of Khaula (her name) had not filled the countries of Bakr, and she had not bestowed, and had not given (W)*], i. e. *خَوْلَةٌ*, and in *مَرَرْتُ بِرَجُلٍ أَفْعَلٍ* *I passed by a foolish man*, i. e. *أَحْمَقٌ*: (2) merely that expression, as in (a) puzzles and

riddles, as <sup>أَكْفُفْ أَكْفُفْ</sup> for <sup>مِهْمَةٌ</sup>; (b) the measures used in the conventional language of the GG to denote the words measured by them, as <sup>أَفْعَلْ صِفَةٌ لَا يَنْصَرِفُ</sup> [9], i. e. <sup>أَفْعَلْ</sup>, when an epithet, is not declined as a triptote, where <sup>أَفْعَلْ</sup> denotes a word whose initial is an aug. Hamza followed by a quiescent ف, followed by an ع pronounced with Fath, followed by a ج, and similarly with the other measures. According to this, then, the *interrog.* <sup>كَمْ</sup> [217] is a *met.*, because it denotes a *question about a particular number*; and so are <sup>مَنْ</sup> [182], <sup>مَا</sup> [180], <sup>كَيْفَ</sup> [207], <sup>أَيْنَ</sup> [206], and other *interrog. ns.*, because each of them is a *question about a particular thing not plainly expressed by its name*; and so are all the *cond. ns.*, because the *cond.* and *interrog.* words are in the sense of <sup>أَيَّ</sup>, which, whether *cond.* or *interrog.* [184], is applied to denote a *particular thing*. These *ns.*, whether *cond.* or *interrog.*, are used as *mets.* for *unlimited particular things*, for the sake of abridgment, since, if, instead of <sup>أَيْنَ</sup> *Where?*, you said <sup>أَفِي الدَّارِ أَمْ فِي السُّوقِ أَمْ فِي الْكَتَابِ</sup> *In the house, or in the market, or in the shop, etc?* to the end of the other *particular places*, it would be too long: so that the *cond.* or *interrog. p.* is supplied before these *ns.*, as S holds; and they are *mets.* for *many particular things*, as we have explained. All *mets.* are

not *uninfl.*; for <sup>فُلَانٌ</sup> and <sup>فُلَانَةٌ</sup>, which belong to them by common consent [14], are *infl.* (R). The [*uninfl.* (IY, R)] *met.* are <sup>كَمْ</sup>, <sup>كَذَا</sup>, [and <sup>كَايِنٌ</sup> (R, A)] for [*vague* (M)] *number*, and <sup>كَيْتٌ</sup> and <sup>ذَيْتٌ</sup> for the *narrative* [226] (M, IH, A) and *announcement* (M). The *interrog.* and *cond. ns.* [184] are not reckoned here, because they have another *cat.*, [that of the conjunct or *adv.*,] to which they are more appropriate. Thus the *met.* are like the *adrs.* [201] in being of two kinds, *infl.* and *uninfl.* (R).

§ 217. <sup>كَمْ</sup> is a *n.* denoting *number vague* (IA, A) in *genus and quantity* [226] (A). It is [of two kinds (M, ML, A),] (1) *interrog.*, [meaning *How many?* (ML, A)]; (2) *enunciatory* (M, IA, ML, A), meaning *How many!* (ML, A). The *interrog.* and *enunciatory* <sup>كَمْ</sup> both denote *number* and *numbered*, the *interrog.* denoting *number vague to the speaker, but known to the person addressed in the opinion of the speaker*; and the *enunciatory* denoting *number vague to the hearer* [223], and *seldom known to the speaker*: while the *numbered* is *unknown to the speaker* in the *interrog.* and *enunciatory* (R); and [for this reason (R)] each of them needs a *sp.* [below] (R, IA, A) explanatory of the *numbered* (R). The *sp.* of the 1st is like that of <sup>عَشْرُونَ</sup> and its sisters [85, 315], being an *acc.* [224] *sing.* [220]: and the *sp.* of the 2nd is sometimes like that of <sup>عَشْرَةٌ</sup>, being a *gen. pl.*, [as



كَمْ مَلُوكٍ بَادَ مَلَكُهُمْ \* وَنَعِيمٍ سَوَقَتْ بَادُوا

*Of how many kings has the kingdom perished, and how many prosperous subjects have perished !* (A)]; and sometimes like that of مَائَةٌ<sup>6</sup>, being a *gen. sing.* [220] (IA, A), as كَمْ عَمَّةٍ الْخ [224] (A). The *interrog.* and enunciatory كَمْ agree in [11] matters (ML, A): (1) they are *ns.* [2] (IY, IA, ML, A), because (a) the *prep.* is prefixed to كَمْ (IY, IA); (b) it is *pre.*, *post.*, and predicated of; (c) the *n.* is made a *subst.* for it; (d) the *pron.* relates to it; and (e) it is an *obj.* [218, 222] (IY): (2) they are *uninfl.* (IY, ML, A), because (a) the *interrog.* implies the sense, and occurs in the place, of the *p.* [159]; and (b) the enunciatory is of the same letter as the *interrog.*, and occurs in the place of رَبَّ [505], which it resembles in that رَبَّ denotes *paucity of the genus*, and كَمْ *multitude of it*, while every *genus* contains *much* and *little*, the *much* being compounded of the *little*, and the *little* being part of the *much*, so that *much* and *little* are partners (IY): (3) their uninflectedness is upon quiescence [159] (IY, A): (4) they are vague (ML): (5) they need a *sp.* [above] (ML, A) because of their vagueness: (6) [219] (A): (7) [225] (IH): (8) they [must (ML, A)] take the head of the sentence (IH, ML, IA, A), (a) the *interrog.* because of the interrogation [584]; and (b) the enunciatory because of the originative sense implied by it in denoting *multitude*, as رَبَّ must take the head

of the sentence because of the originative sense implied by it in denoting *paucity* [505] (R): and therefore they are not governed by what precedes them [445], except the *pre. n.* and *prep.* [218]: (9) they are parsed alike [218] (A): (10) [223]: (11) [222] (R). They differ in [8 (A)] matters:—(1) the sentence with the enunciatory admits of being pronounced true or false, contrary to the sentence with the *interrog.* [1]: (2) the enunciatory does not require a reply, contrary to the *interrog.*: (3) the *subst.* for the enunciatory is not conjoined with the Hamza, as <sup>كَمْ عَبِيدٍ لِي خَمْسُونَ بَلْ سِتُونَ</sup> *How many slaves I have! Fifty: nay, sixty!*, contrary to the *subst.* for the *interrog.* [154], as <sup>كَمْ مَالِكَ إِعْشُرُونَ أَمْ ثَلَاثُونَ</sup> *How many dirhams [219] is, or are [218], thy property? Twenty or thirty?*: (4) the *sp.* of the *interrog.* is [orig. (A)] in the *acc.* [224]; whereas the *sp.* of the enunciatory is [orig. (A)] in the *gen.* [224]: (5) [220] (ML, A): (6) [221]: (7) the *interrog.* does not indicate *multitude*; whereas the enunciatory does, contrary to the opinion of ITr and his pupil IKh: (8) the enunciatory is peculiar to the *pret.*, like <sup>دَبَّ</sup> [505].

§ 218. The 2 kinds of <sup>كَمْ</sup>, (1) if preceded by a *prep.* or *pre. n.*, [as <sup>عَلَّامٌ كَمْ رَجُلٍ</sup> or <sup>بَكْمِ دِرْهَمٍ أَشْتَرَيْتَ</sup>], are governed in the *gen.*: (2) if not, then, (a) if *mets.* for an *inf. n.* or *adv.*, [as <sup>كَمْ ضَرْبَةٌ ضَرْبَتْ</sup> or

كَمْ يَوْمًا صَحَّتْ (Sn),] are governed in the *acc.* as *inf.* *ns.* or *advs.*: (b) if not, then, (a) if not immediately followed by a *v.* [as كَمْ رَجُلٍ فِي الدَّارِ (Sn),] or, if followed by a *v.* that is *intrans.*,] as كَمْ رَجُلٌ قَامَ (Sn),] or that [is *trans.*, but (Sn)] governs their *pron.* or their connected in the *nom.*, [as كَمْ رَجُلٌ ضَرَبَ عَمْرًا or ضَرَبَ أَخُوهُ كَمْ (Sn),] are *inchs.* [below]; (b) if followed by a *trans.* *v.* that has not got its *obj.*, [whether it govern one or more *objs.*, as كَمْ رَجُلٍ ضَرَبَتْ or كَمْ تَعْطَى زَيْدًا (Sn),] are *objs.*; whereas, if it has got its *obj.*, [as كَمْ رَجُلٌ ضَرَبَ كَمْ (Sn),] they are *inchs.*, unless the *obj.* be a *pron.* relating to them, [as كَمْ رَجُلٌ ضَرَبْتَهُ (Sn),] in which case they are *inchs.* or *accs.* by distraction [62] (A), the former, says Dm, being preferable (Sn). كَمْ in كَمْ مَالِكَ [217, 219] may be the *enunc.* or *inch.* [above] (IY).

§ 219. The *sp.* [of both kinds (Jm, A)] is sometimes suppressed [87] (M, IH, IA, ML, A), when indicated (R, IA, Jm, A,) as كَمْ مَالِكَ *How many (dirhams or dinārs) is, or are* [218], *thy property?* (M, IH), i. e. كَمْ دِرْهَمًا or دِينَارًا (M, Jm), or *How many (etc) thy property is!* or *are thy property!*, i. e. كَمْ دِرْهَمٍ or دِينَارٍ (Jm), and

كَمْ ضَرَبْتَ How many (times or strokes) hast thou struck?,  
or thou hast struck! (IH), i. e. كَمْ مَرَّةً or ضَرْبَةً (Jm);  
but suppression is not good with the enunciatory, because  
suppression of the *post.* with retention of the *pre.* is bad  
[128] (IY).

§ 220. The *sp.* of the *interrog.* is always *sing.* (M, ML, A), unrestrictedly (A), i. e. whether *sorts* be meant by it or not (Sn), contrary to the opinion of the KK (ML, A), who allow it to be *pl.* (A, DM), unrestrictedly (A); and in كَمْ لَكَ غُلَامَاتٍ How many (persons) hast thou, being servants? the *sp.* is [held by the BB to be (Sn)] suppressed, غُلَامَاتٍ being [governed in the *acc.* as (M)] a *d. s.* (M, Sn) by the verbal sense contained in the *adv.* [75], i. e. كَمْ نَفْسًا لَكَ غُلَامَاتٍ (M), i. e. خُدَامًا [77] (Sn): but some make a distinction, saying that, if the question be about *multitudes*, as كَمْ غُلَامَاتٍ لَكَ meaning *How many sorts of servants hast thou?*, it is allowable, but otherwise not; and this is the opinion of Akh (A). According to the BB, you do not say كَمْ رَجُلًا وَنِسَاءً; but some GG allow it, because what is not allowable in the *ant.* is allowable in the *appos.* [538], as الْوَاهِبُ أَلْمَائَةُ الْغَنَى [112] (R). The *sp.* of the enunciatory is *sing.*, [as كَمْ عَمَّةٌ آلُ الْغَنَى (224) (ML)]; or *pl.* (ML, A), as كَمْ مَلُوكٍ آلُ الْغَنَى [217]

(ML): but the *sing.* is more frequent and chaste than the *pl.*; though the *pl.* is not anomalous, as some assert (A).

§ 221. The *interrog.* (R, A) كَمْ may be separated from its *sp.* (IY, R, A) by the *adv.* and *prep.* (IY) in a case of choice (R, A), as كَمْ لَكَ غُلَامًا How many servants hast thou? (IY, R); but the enunciatory is not separated from its *sp.*, except in a case of necessity [below] (A), if its *sp.* be governed in the *gen.* by prothesis, so that XLIV. 24. [below] is not an instance to the contrary (Sh). The *sp.* of the *interrog.* كَمْ is always in the *acc.* [224] (IY). When the enunciatory is separated from its *sp.*, the latter is governed in (1) the *acc.* (M, A) by assimilation to [the *sp.* of] the *interrog.*, (a) necessarily, if the separation be by a *prop.*, or by an *adv.* and *prep.* and *gen.* together (A), because separation of the *pre.* and *post.* [225] is bad [125], especially by something else than the *prep.* and *gen.* [498] (IY), as

كَمْ نَالَنِي مِنْهُمْ فُضْلًا عَلَى عَدَمٍ \* إِنَّ لَا أَكُنْ مِنَ الْاِقْتَارِ احْتِمَلٍ  
[by AlKutāmī, How many a bounty has reached me from them in destitution, when I was not near to journeying from poverty (IY, AAz) for want of a riding-beast (AAz)] and

تَوَّمتُ سِنَانًا وَكَمْ دُونَهُ \* مِنَ الْأَرْضِ مُحْدَوِدًا غَارَهَا

(M, A), by Zuhair [or his son Ka'b, though not found in their *Diwāns* (FA), or by Ibn Muḩbil (AAz), describing his she-camel (IY)], She seeks Sinān [Ibn Abi Ḩāritha

alMurri (FA)], and how many a tract of ground whose hollow is rugged is before him! (IY, AAz, FA); (b) preferably, if the separation be by an *adv.* alone, or by a *prep.* and *gen.* alone, as in the next *exs.* (Sn): (2) the *gen.*, in poetry (M, A) exclusively, with separation by (a) an *adv.*, as

كَمْ نُونٌ مَيَّةٌ مَوَاةٌ يَهَالُ لَهَا \* إِذَا تَيَمَّمَهَا الْخَزِيئَةُ ذُرَّ الْجَلَدُ

[How many a desert that the skilful, hardy guide is appalled at, when he directs his course to it, is before Mayya! (Sn)]; (b) a *prep.* and *gen.* (A), as

كَمْ فِي بَنِي سَعْدِ بْنِ بَكْرِ سَيِّدٍ \* ضَخْمٍ الدَّسِيعَةِ مَاجِدٍ نَفَّاعٍ

(M, A), by AlFarazdaq (IY, FA), *How many a chief, large in bounty, glorious, very beneficent, is among the Banu Sa'd Ibn Bakr!* (IY, AAz, FA), and

كَمْ بِجُودٍ مُقَرَّبٍ نَالَ الْعُلَى \* وَكَرِيمٍ بَخْلَةٍ قَدْ وَضَعَهُ

(IY, A) *How many a mongrel has by munificence attained eminence, and how many a noble has his own niggardliness abased!* (Sn): so says IM, and this is the opinion of S (A). When the separation between the enunciatory

كَمْ and its *sp.* is by a *trans. v.*, مِنْ must be put, in order that the *sp.* may not be confounded with the *obj.* of that [*trans.*

(R)] *v.*, as كَمْ تَرَكُوا مِنْ جَنَّاتٍ XLIV. 24. *How many gardens did they leave!* [above] (R, Sn). And, with separation,

the state of the *interrog.* كَمْ whose *sp.* is governed in the *gen.* [224] is like that of the enunciatory كَمْ (R).

§ 222. كُمْ [in both its states (R)] is *sing. masc.* in letter (IY, R); but applies in sense to the *fem., du.* [below], and *pl.* (IY). The *pron.* relates to it according to the letter or sense (M, R), as كُمْ رَجُلًا جَارِكٌ [notwithstanding that the number asked about is *du.* or *pl.* (R)] or جَارِكٌ [says An (R)] or جَارِكٌ, and كُمْ امْرَأَةً جَارِكٌ or جَارِكٌ [or جَارِكٌ (IY)] or جُنُكٌ (IY, R), whence لِيْلِي 26. *And the intercession of how many Angels in the heavens shall avail not aught!* (M) and VII. 3. [126] (IY). But some say that كُمْ is *sing.* in letter, *pl.* in sense, like كُلُّ [117]: and, according to this, the *pron.* of the *du.* [above] ought not to relate to it, which is the truth, because, if you might interrogate with كُمْ about the number of the multitude who came to the person addressed distributed into two and two, you would be obliged to say كُمْ رَجُلَيْنِ, since, when you intend to distribute a multitude into sets of two or more, the *du.* or *pl.* must be distinctly expressed, as in اَفْضَلُ رَجُلَيْنِ or رَجَالٍ [118] and اَيُّ رَجُلَيْنِ or رَجَالٍ *Which, or What, two men, or men?*; whereas كُمْ رَجُلَيْنِ has not been heard, either in interrogation or enunciation.

§ 223. كُمْ is peculiar to *indets.*, the *interrog.* because the *sp.* must be *indet.* [83]; and the enunciatory because

it is a *met.* for *number vague to the hearer* [217], so that the *numbered* also are made vague, in order to be more indicative of the vagueness of their *number* (R). You say <sup>سأ</sup>كَمْ <sup>سأ</sup>غَيْرُهُ لَكَ or <sup>سأ</sup>مِثْلُهُ or <sup>سأ</sup>خَيْرًا مِنْهُ *How many other than, or like, or better than, it hast thou?* [114, 355]; and <sup>سأ</sup>كَمْ <sup>سأ</sup>غَيْرُهُ <sup>سأ</sup>مِثْلُهُ لَكَ *How many other than it, like it, hast thou?*, making <sup>سأ</sup>مِثْلُهُ an *ep.* of <sup>سأ</sup>غَيْرُهُ (M). But, as for your saying <sup>سأ</sup>كَمْ شَاةٌ وَسَخَلَتْهَا *How many a sheep etc!* [538] and <sup>سأ</sup>كَمْ نَاقَةٌ وَفَصِيلُهَا [114], it is because the coupled also is *indet.* [262] (R).

§ 224. As to the case of the *sp.* of the *interrog.* there are three opinions, (1) that the *acc.* [221] is necessary unrestrictedly, [i. e. whether a *prep.* be prefixed to <sup>سأ</sup>كَمْ or not (Sn)]: (2) that it is not necessary; but that the *gen.* [221] is allowable, unrestrictedly, by assimilation to [the *sp.* of] the enunciatory <sup>سأ</sup>كَمْ [225]: this is the opinion of Fr, Zj, and Sf; and the saying <sup>سأ</sup>كَمْ عَمَّةٌ الْخ [below] is thus explained by most, [upon the ground that <sup>سأ</sup>كَمْ is an ironical *interrog.* (Sn)]: (3) that it is necessary if a *prep.* be not prefixed to <sup>سأ</sup>كَمْ, and preferable to the *gen.* if a *prep.* be prefixed to it: this is the well known opinion; and S does not mention the *gen.* except when a *prep.* is prefixed to <sup>سأ</sup>كَمْ (A). The



*gen.* is allowable only when <sup>اَکُم</sup> is governed in the *gen.* by a *prep.* (R, ML), as <sup>اَشْتَرَيْتَ بِکُمْ دِرْهَمًا</sup> [515] (ML, A), in which case the *sp.* may be in (1) the *acc.*, [which is frequent (ML)] ; (2) the *gen.* (R, ML, A), contrary to the opinion of some (ML), in order that <sup>اَکُم</sup> and its *sp.* may agree in case (R). As some assert (ML), some of the Arabs (IY, R), the Banu Tamīm (IY, ML, A), make the enunciatory <sup>اَکُم</sup> govern its [*sing.* (R, ML, A) or *pl.* (R, Sn)] *sp.* in the *acc.* (IY, R, ML, A), even without separation [221] (R), as though they supplied Tanwīn in it [84] ; which is good Arabic, though the *gen.* is more frequent (IY). And the verse [of AlFarazdaq (M, ML, Sn), who was a Tamīmī (IY, Sn),]

کَمْ عَمَّةٌ لَّکَ يَا جَرِيرٌ وَخَالَئٌ \* قَدْ دَعَا قَدْ حَلَبَتْ عَلَيَّ عِشَارِي

is related with (1) the *acc.*, (a) by supposing <sup>اَکُم</sup> to be [an ironical (ML, A)] *interrog.*, *How many paternal aunts of thine, O Jarīr, and maternal aunts, bow-legged have milked in spite of me my lately delivered she-camels ?* ; [(b) according to the *dial.* of Tamīm, *How many a paternal aunt of thine, O Jarīr, and maternal aunt, have milked etc!* (IY, ML, A)] : (2) the *gen.*, by supposing <sup>اَکُم</sup> to be [an ironical *interrog.* (above) or] enunciatory [217] : (3) the *nom.* [as an *inch.* (25) (IY, ML, A)], by supposing the sense to be *How many (times)* (M, ML, A) or

(*milkings*), كَمْ being an *adv.* or *inf. n.* (IY, ML, A), and the *sp.* suppressed, i. e. كَمْ وَقْتُ or حَلْبَةٌ [upon the supposition that كَمْ is enunciatory, or وَقْتُ or حَلْبَةٌ upon the supposition that it is an ironical *interrog.* (DM)], has a *paternal aunt of thine, O Jarir, and (has) a maternal aunt, or (has) a paternal etc, and has a maternal aunt,* a 2nd قَدْ حَلَبْتُ being necessarily supplied [as *enunc.* of خَالَئ or عَمَّة (Sn, DM)], because the *inch.* in this case is multiple in letter and sense (ML, A).

§ 225. When the *sp.* of the *interrog.* كَمْ is in the *gen.* [224], it is governed, [according to the GG (R),] by مِنْ [necessarily (ML)] understood [515], [which is the opinion of Khl, S, Fr, and many (A)]; but, according to Zj, by prothesis (R, ML, A), as in the case of the enunciatory (R). The enunciatory is *pre.* to its *sp.* [221], governing it as every *pre.* governs the *post.* [110] (M). مِنْ is [frequently (M)] prefixed [to the *sp.* (IY, R, Jm)] after the [*interrog.* and (IH)] enunciatory كَمْ (M, IH): that construction is frequent in the case of the enunciatory (R, Jm), as VII. 3. [126] and LIII. 26. [222] (M, R, Jm), because the prothesis here is renderable by مِنْ [111], as in بَابُ سَاجٍ [85] (IY), [and] because the *sp.* then agrees in case with the *sp. post.* to كَمْ;

but, as for the *interrog.* كَمْ, I have not met with its *sp.* governed in the *gen.* by مِنْ in poetry or prose, nor is its allowability indicated by any book on grammar (R, Jm), nor do I know what is the truth of it (R): so says R; but Z [followed by B] allows كَمْ in II. 207. [62] to be *interrog.* and enunciatory (Jm). And, when the *sp.* is governed in the *gen.* by مِنْ, then كَمْ is [necessarily (R)] construed to be pronounced with Tanwīn [110] (M, R), as though you said كَثِيرٌ مِنَ الْقَرْيِ and مِنَ الْمَلَائِكَةِ; while, according to some, [vid. the KK (IY),] كَمْ is always [construed to be (IY)] pronounced with Tanwīn, the *gen.* after it being governed by مِنْ [expressed or (IY)] understood (M).

§ 226. كَذَا and كَأَيُّ are like the enunciatory كَمْ in denoting *multitude* (IĀ, A) of *number vague in genus and quantity* [217]. Each of them agrees with كَمْ in some matters, and differs from it in others. كَذَا agrees with كَمْ in 4 matters, uninflectedness, vagueness, needing the *sp.*, and importing *multitude*. And it differs from كَمْ in 4 matters:— (1) it is compounded of the ك of *comparison* [509] and the *dem.* ذَا [171] (A): (2) it does not [necessarily (A)] take the head of the sen-

tence, as كَذَا وَكَذَا دِرْهَمًا I took so many dirhams :

(3) it is mostly used coupled to, as

عَدِ النَّفْسُ نَعْمَى بَعْدَ بُؤْسَاكِ ذَاكِرًا  
كَذَا وَكَذَا لُطْفًا بِهِ نَسِيَ الْجَهْدَ

[Promise the soul happiness after thy distress, remembering so many pleasures wherewith hardship has been forgotten (Jsh)]; and IKh asserts that they do not say

كَذَا كَذَا دِرْهَمًا nor كَذَا دِرْهَمًا ; but IM mentions that

this has been heard, though rarely : (4) its *sp.* must be governed in the *acc.* ; and may not be governed in the

*gen.* by مِئ, by common consent ; nor by prothesis, contrary to the opinion of the KK, who, when there is

neither repetition or coupling, allow كَذَا ثَوْبٍ and

مِائَةُ ثَوْبٍ by analogy to the genuine *num.*, [like مِائَةُ ثَوْبٍ

and ثَلَاثَةُ أَثَوَابٍ (DM)]. The compounded كَذَا [single

or coupled (A)] occurs also as a *met.* for something else

than *number*, [vid. the *narrative, det. or indet.* (A), i. e. the expression occurring in the narration of a thing, whether

deed or saying (Sn),] whence the tradition يُقَالُ لِلْعَبْدِ يَوْمَ

الْقِيَامَةِ اَتَذْكُرُ يَوْمَ كَذَا وَكَذَا It will be said to the servant

on the day of resurrection, Dost thou remember the day

of *such and such*? . and كَذَا also consists of two words in their original sense, vid. the ك of *comparison* and dem. ذَا, whence

وَأَسْلَمَنِي الزَّمَانُ كَذَا \* فَلَا طَرْبُ وَلَا أَمْسٌ

[*And time has abandoned me grieved like this; so that there is neither mirth nor sociability* (DM)]; and the premonitory هَا [551] is prefixed to it, as اهْكَذَا عَرْشُكَ

XXVII. 42. *Is thy throne like this?* كَايْنُ agrees with كَمْ in 5 matters, uninflectedness, vagueness, needing the *sp.*, always taking the head of the sentence, and importing sometimes *multitude*, which is mostly the case, [as III. 140. (24) (ML),] and sometimes *interrogation* [below], which is extraordinary, and is authorized only by IKb, IU, and IM, the last of whom cites as evidence the saying of Ubayy Ibn Ka'b to Ibn Mas'ūd كَايْنُ تَقْرَأُ سُورَةَ الْأَحْزَابِ آيَةً How many verses readest [i. e. reckonest (Sn)] thou the Chapter of *The Confederates* [Kur. XXXIII] to be?, upon which he said "Seventy-three." And it differs from كَمْ in 5 [or rather 6] matters:— (1) it is compounded of the ك of *comparison* and كَايْنُ, for which reason it may be paused upon with the ن, because the Tanwīn, when affixed in composition, resembles the *rad.* ن, for which reason it is written in

the Codex as a **ن**; while he that pauses [upon **كَأَيُّ** (ML)] with elision of the **ن** has regard to its predicament in the *o. f.*, namely elision in pause [609]: whereas **كَمْ** is simple: (2) its *sp.* is governed (a) in the *gen.* by **مِنْ**, which is so often the case that IU asserts it to be always so, whence III. 140. [above]; (b) in the *acc.*, as

أَطْرَدَ الْيَاسَ بِالرَّجَاءِ فَكَأَيُّ \* أَلَمَّا حَمَّ يَسْرَةً بَعْدَ عُسْرِ

[*Drive away despair with hope: for how many a pain-stricken wretch has had his ease decreed after distress!* (Jsh)] and

وَكَأَيُّ لَنَا فَضْلًا عَلَيْكُمْ وَمِنَّةٌ \* قَدِيمًا وَلَا تَكْذِبُونَ مَا مِنْ مَنَعٍ

[*And how many favors and obligations have we conferred upon you aforetime! And ye know not what obligations a benefactor has conferred!* (Jsh)]: (3) it does not occur as an *interrog.*, according to the majority, as shown above: (4) it does not occur governed in the *gen.*, contrary to the opinion of IKb and IU, who allow

بِكَأَيُّ تَبِيعَ هَذَا الثَّوْبِ *For how much wilt thou sell this garment?*

(ML, A), where it is *interrog.* (DM): (5) its *enunc.* does not occur as a single term (ML); but as a *prop.*,

as in the texts, contrary to **كَمْ**, as **كَمْ رَجُلٌ قَائِمٌ** *How many a man is standing!* (DM): (6) its *sp.* occurs only *sing.*

(A). It has 5 *dial. vars.* [transmitted by Th (IY)], (1)

كَايُنُ [the original and chastest one (IY, A), which is read by the Seven except Ibn Kathīr (A)] ; (2) كَأُنَى, upon the measure of كَاعُنَى, [the next best, which {is read by Ibn Kathīr, and (A)} is most frequent in poetry (IY, A), as in the 2 preceding verses and وَكَأُنَى بِالْأَبَاطِحِ الْخ (166) (A)] ; (3) كَايُنُ, upon the measure of كَعَيْنِي, [which is read by AlA'mash and Ibn Muḥaisin (A)] ; (4) كَيْتُنِ, upon the measure of كَيْعُنِي ; (5) كَانٌ, upon the measure of كَعُنِ (M, A).

§ 227. كَيْتٌ and ذَيْتٌ are contracted from كَيْتَةٌ and ذَيْتَةٌ [689]. They are pronounced with Fath, Kasr (M, R, A), and Damm (M, R, Sn) of the ت, Fath being the best known (A). Pause upon them is [with the ت (R),] as in بَمَتْ (M, R) and اَخْتٌ (M). They are used [by many of the Arabs (M)] according to the *o. f.* (M, R, A), as كَانٌ مِنَ الْأَمْرِ كَيْتٌ وَكَيْتٌ and ذَيْتٌ وَذَيْتٌ (IY, A) : and then are pronounced only with Fath (R, A), because of the heaviness of the reduplication ; and are paused upon with the ة [646]. And AU transmits كَيْتٌ with the ة pronounced with Fath and Kasr in place of the ت of

كَيْتٌ [690]. They are *uninfl.*, because each of them is a word occurring in the place of the sentence, while the *prop.*, as such, is not entitled to either inflection or uninflectedness (R). They are always repeated (M, R, A) with the *con.* و, as قَالَ فُلَانٌ كَيْتٌ وَكَيْتٌ Such a one said so and so and كَانَ مِنَ الْأَمْرِ ذَيْتٌ وَذَيْتٌ Such and such circumstances of the matter took place (R), in order that they may not be imagined to be *mets.* for single words (IY). It is a mistake to say قَالَ فُلَانٌ كَيْتٌ because the Arabs say كَانَ مِنَ الْأَمْرِ كَيْتٌ وَكَيْتٌ and قَالَ فُلَانٌ ذَيْتٌ وَذَيْتٌ, making كَيْتٌ وَكَيْتٌ a *met.* for deeds, and ذَيْتٌ وَذَيْتٌ for speech (D).

---



## CHAPTER VI.

### THE DUAL NOUN.

§ 228. Dualization is the addition of one *n.* to another like it (IY). The *du.* is that [*n.* (IY)] to whose final 2 augments, (1) an *h* [in the *nom.* (IY)], or a *س* [in the *acc.* and *gen.* (IY)] preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, and (2) a *ن* pronounced with Kasr, are affixed, in order that the 1st [*aug.* (IY)] may be a sign of the addition of *sing.* to *sing.*, [and a compensation for the suppressed *n.* (IY),] and the other may be a compensation for what is prevented [by the addition of another *n.* (IY)], vid. the vowel and Tanwīn existing in the *sing.* (M). The *o. f.* of the *du.* [and *pl.* (R)] is [said to be (R)] coupling (IY, R) with the *و* [539] (R). The *du.* is that [*n.* (YS)] which indicates *two* [*things* (YS)] and serves instead of 2 [*ns.*] coupled together, like *الزَّيْدَانِ* *The two Zaid*s, its *o. f.* being *زَيْدٌ وَزَيْدٌ* *Zaid and Zaid*, from which they deviate out of dislike to the prolixity and tautology (Fk). This is shown by the fact that the poet, when constrained, reverts to coupling (IY, R), which is frequent in poetry (IY); and that coupling sometimes occurs anomalously in prose (R): and it is confirmed by the fact that you do not put the *du.*

in the case of different *ns.*, as جَاءَنِي زَيْدٌ وَعَمْرُو , because one of the 2 expressions does not indicate the other (IY). But, when *multiplication* is intended, as

لَوْ عَلَى قَبْرِ وَقَبْرِ كُنْتُ أَكْرَمَهُمْ \* مَيْتًا وَابْعَدَهُمْ مِنْ مَنْزِلِ الْأَذَامِ

[by 'Isām Ibn 'Ubaid azZimmānī, *If grave and grave were reckoned, I should be the noblest of them when dead, and the farthest of them from the abode of blame* (T)], or the 2 *ns.* are separated by a separative either expressed,

as جَاءَنِي رَجُلٌ طَوِيلٌ وَرَجُلٌ قَصِيرٌ *A tall man and a short*

*man came to me*, or supplied, as جَاءَنِي رَجُلٌ فَأَكْرَمْتُ الرَّجُلَ

وَالرَّجُلَ الَّذِي ضَرَبْتَهُ *A man came to me, and I honored*

*the (coming) man and the man that thou didst beat*, i. e.

الرَّجُلَ الْجَائِي , coupling is allowable, as you see, without

anomaly or exigency. And, in order to denote *multiplication*, the *n.* is sometimes repeated without coupling, as

LXXXIX. 22. [132]; or dualized, as ثُمَّ ارْجِعِ الْبَصَرَ كَرَّتَيْنِ

LXVII. 4. *Then repeat the gaze twice* and لَبَّيْكَ [115]

(R). For every *n.* that is dualized 8 conditions are prescribed [234]:— (1) *sing.* number; (2) inflection; (3) absence of composition; (4) indeterminateness; (5) agreement in letter; (6) agreement in sense; (7) objective existence of a second to it; (8) that the place of its *du.* should not be supplied by the *du.* of another word (Fk), or rather by another word. The following *ns.*

therefore are not dualized:— (1) the *du.* and perfect *pl.* [232]: (2) the *uninfl.*, contrary to the opinion of Mb: (3) the *att. comp.*, by common consent [234]; and the synthetic, contrary to the opinion of the KK and their followers; and the *n.* ending in <sup>ا</sup>وَيْعَ, contrary to the opinion of some, which is adopted by Syt: (4) the proper name, while it retains its quality of proper name [171]: (5) *ns.* applied to denote what has no second in existence, like <sup>شَمْسُ</sup> *sun* and <sup>قَمَرٌ</sup> *moon*, when the proper [not tropical] signification is intended: (6) the trope and homonym with respect to their different significations: (7) such as <sup>شَمْسِي</sup> and <sup>قَمَرِي</sup> [above]; but this condition can be dispensed with, its place being supplied by the condition of agreement in letter: (8) <sup>بَعْضِي</sup>, <sup>سِرَاسِي</sup>, and <sup>ضَبْعَانِي</sup> the name of the *male hyena*, because the place of their *du.* is supplied by the *du.* of <sup>جَزِي</sup>, <sup>سِي</sup>, and <sup>ضَبْعِي</sup> the name of the *female*, though <sup>سَوَائِي</sup> and <sup>ضَبْعَانَانِي</sup> are transmitted; and the *nums.* other than <sup>مَائِي</sup> and <sup>الف</sup>, contrary to the opinion of Akh, because the place of the *du.* of <sup>ثَلَاثِي</sup> *Three* is supplied by <sup>سِتِّي</sup> *Six*; and <sup>اَجْمَعِي</sup> and <sup>جَمْعَانِي</sup>, according to the opinion of the BB, because the place of their *du.* is supplied by <sup>كَلَّي</sup> and <sup>كَلَّي</sup> (YS). But they say <sup>اَلْعَمْرَانِي</sup> meaning *Abū Bakr and 'Umar*, and

القمران meaning *The sun and moon*, because here the matter is plain and free from dubiety. The *du.* is of 2 kinds, (1) that in which the letter of dualization is affixed to the *n.*, while the latter is constructively separate, as رَجُلَانِ [229], عَصَوَانِ, and all that precede; (2) that which is formed as a *du.*, but in which the *sing.* is not constructively separate, as مَنْرَوَانِ [229] and عَقْلَتَهُ بِنَيَّابَيْنِ *I knee-haltred him with two ends of a rope* [230], neither مَنْرَوَانِ nor ثَنَيَّابَيْنِ having a *sing.* (IY). When the *du.* is not that of an abbreviated *n.* [229], the form of the *sing.* remains in it preserved (M), as XX. 66. [525] and XXVIII. 14. فَوَجَدَ فِيهَا رَجُلَيْنِ يَقْتَتِلَانِ *And he found in it two men fighting together* (AAz). The *ø* of feminization is elided (1) in [only 2 words (M),] خَصِيَّانِ and أَلْيَانِ (M, IH), by analogy خَصِيَّتَانِ and أَلْيَانِ (IY, R), which also are allowable, by common consent, as

بَلَىٰ أَيْرَ الْحِمَارِ وَخَصِيَّتَا \* أَحَبَّ إِلَيَّ فَزَارَةُ مِنْ فَزَارِ

*Yes, the penis of the he-ass and his 2 testicles are dearer to Fazāra than Fazāra or a Fazarī* and مَتِيْمًا نَلْقَنِي الْحَمَّ [74]; while خَصِيَّانِ and أَلْيَانِ are said by some to be poetic licenses, because they do not occur except in poetry, as

كَانَ خُصْيِيَّةً مِّنَ التَّدَادُلِ \* ظُرْفٌ عَجُوزٍ فِيهِ ثَنَتَا حَنْظَلٍ

[by Khiṭām alMujāshiʿī, quoting from a woman who said it of her husband (AAz), *As though his two testicles from dangling were an old woman's pot wherein were 2 colocynths*, properly حَنْظَلَتَانِ (IY, AAz).] and

طُعِينَةٌ وَأَفَقَةٌ فِي الرِّكْبِ \* يَرْتَجِ الْيَلَاءُ ارْتِجَاجَ الْوُطْبِ

(M, R) He is a like a woman's camel-litter standing still among the camel-riders : his two buttocks quiver with the quivering of the milk-skin [85] : (2) sometimes in other words, as وَنَحْرُ آخٍ [532] (AAz). The ن of the *du.* is elided an account of (1) prothesis [110] (M, IH), as in the saying of the Prophet الْحَسَنِ وَالْحُسَيْنِ سَيِّدَا شَبَابِ أَهْلِ الْجَنَّةِ *AlHasan and AlHusain are the two chiefs of the youth of the people of Paradise* (AAz); (2) poetic license [233], as in هُمَا خُطَّتَا آخٍ [44]; (3) abridgment of the *conj.*, as in الضَّارِبَا زَيْدًا with the *acc.* [344] (R) : and its ! [also is elided (IY)] because of meeting a quiescent, as in [جَاؤَنِي غُلَامَا ابْنِكَ] *The two menservants of thy son came to me* and (IY) [الْتَقَتَا حَلَقَتَا الْبَطَانِ] [610, 663] (M).

§ 229. If the *decl. n.* be sound in the final or defective [16], the sign of the *du.* is affixed to it without

alteration, as رَجُلَانِ [228], جَارِيَّتَانِ, and قَاضِيَانِ from رَجُلٌ, جَارِيَّةٌ, and قَاضٍ (IA). The word is altered in the

*du.* in 3 sorts [of *n.*], the abbreviated [16], the prolonged [230], and the [*n.*] arbitrarily curtailed of its final [231] (R). The *l* of the abbreviated is either 3rd or upwards. If it be 3rd, then, (1) if an *o. f.* of it in the و or ي be known, it is restored to its *o. f.* in the *du.*, as عَصَوَانِ and قَتِيَانِ (M) from عَصَا and قَتَى (IY) : the poet says

وَقَدْ أَعَدَدْتُ لِلْعِذَالِ عِنْدِي \* عَصَا فِي رَأْسِهَا مَنَوَا حَدِيدَ

*And I have made ready, for the upbraiders beside me, a staff on whose head are two manà-weights of iron* (A) ;

and the *Kur* has وَدَخَلَ مَعَهُ السَّجْنِ قَتِيَانِ XII. 36. *And two young men entered the prison with him* (IY, A) :

while جَمْدَانِ from حَمَى is anomalous (A), because its *l* is a substitute for a ي (Sn) : (2) if its *o. f.* be unknown, then, (a) if it be pronounced with *Imāla*, it is converted into ي, as مَتِيَانِ and بَلِيَانِ from مَتَى and بَلَى [639] when used as names ; (b) if not, it is converted into و, as لَدَوَانِ and لَوَانِ [686] from لَدَى and أَلَى when used as names (M). As to the 2 *l*s that are not substituted [for a known *o. f.*, being either not substituted at

all, or substituted for an *o. f.* whose identity is unknown (Sn)], vid. the *rad.* **ا**, i. e. that which is in a *p.*, [as **بَئِ** (Sn),] or its like, [as **مَتِ** (Sn),] and the **ا** whose *o. f.* is unknown, [which IUK exemplifies by such as **اَلَكَّ** *play*, because, says he, one does not know whether its **ا** be from a **ي** or **و** (Sn),] there are 3 [or rather 4 (Sn)] opinions:— (1) the well known one, that their state with respect to Imāla is regarded, so that, if pronounced with Imāla, they are dualized with the **ي**; and, if not, with the **و**: this is the opinion of S, and is decisively asserted by IM here : (2) that, if pronounced with Imāla or converted into **ي** in any position, they are dualized with the **ي**; and, if not, with the **و**: this opinion is preferred by IU, and is decisively asserted by IM in the Kāfiya : and, according to this, **اَلِى**, **عَلِى**, and **كُدِى** are dualized with the **ي**, because their **ا** is converted into **ا** with the *pron.* [129, 205] ; while, according to the 1st, they are dualized with the **و**; both of which sayings are transmitted from Akh : (3) that the *rad.* and unknown **ا** are converted into **ي** unrestrictedly, [i. e. whether they be pronounced with Imāla or not, and whether they be converted into **ي** in any position or not : (4) that they are converted into **و**, whether they be pronounced with Imāla or not, as in the Ham' (Sn)]. The **ا** sometimes has 2 *o. fs.* with respect to 2 *dials.*, in

which case 2 modes are allowable, as رَحِيّ, which belongs to the ي in the *dial.* that says رَحِيّت, and to the و in the *dial.* that says رَحوت; so that the *du.* may be رَحِيّان and رَحَوّان, though the ي is more frequent (A). If, however, the ʾ be above the 3rd, it is converted into ي only, [because, when the abbreviated exceeds 3 letters, its ʾ is either converted from a ي or assimilated to what is converted from it (IY),] as مَرَمِيّان from مَرَمِيّ, where the ʾ is *orig.* converted from the ي (IY);] مَلْهِيّان [from مَلْهِيّ, where the ʾ is converted from a ي, and the ي is a substitute for the و (685, 727) (IY)]; and حَبْلِيّان, حَبَارِيّان, [أَرطِيّان, and قُبْعَثَرِيّان, from حَبْلِيّ (263), حَبَارِيّ (378), أَرطِيّ (18, 497), and قُبْعَثَرِيّ (401), where the ʾ is not converted from any thing, but is in the predicament of what is converted from the ي (727), since the و does not occur as a final when 4th (or upwards) (IY)]. As for مَنْدَرَدَان [721], it is because the dualization in it is inseparable, like the femininization in شَقَاوَةٌ [266] (M), so that it has no *sing.* [228], as شَقَاوَةٌ has no *masc.* (IY): ‘Antara says

أَحْرَاقِي تَنْفُضُ اسْتِكَ مَنْدَرَدِيهَا \* لِتَقْتَلَنِي فَهَإِنَّا ذَا عَمَارَا

(Mb, IY), satirizing ‘Umāra Ibn Ziyād al‘Absī, *What!*



round me does thy rump shake its two buttocks, that thou mayst slay me? Then, mark, I am this hero [552], 'Umāra! (AAz) ; whereas, if it had a *sing.*, you would say مَرَّيَان in the *du.* (Mb). This is the opinion of the BB about the abbreviated that exceeds 3 letters, whether its letters be few or many : but the KK relate that, when the abbreviated transcends 1 letters, and its letters are many, the Arabs elide its *l* in the *du.* (IY). قَهْقَرَان and خَوْزَلَان, with elision [of the *ي* (Sn)], in the *du.* of the *quin.* قَهْقَرَى and خَوْزَلَى are anomalous (A). In short, the *l* of the abbreviated is converted into (1) *ي* in 3 positions, (a) when it is 4th or upwards ; (b) when it is 3rd, a substitute for a *ي* ; (c) when it is 3rd, unknown in *o. f.* and pronounced with *Imāla* : (2) *و* in 2 positions, (a) when it is 3rd, a substitute for a *و* ; (b) when it is 3rd, unknown in *o. f.*, and not pronounced with *Imāla* (IA). The whole of the anomalies in the abbreviated one 3, (1) مَرَّوَان : (2) خَوْزَلَان and قَهْقَرَان, which the KK hold to be regular : (3) رَضِيَان, which Ks holds to be regular ; so that he allows رَضَى and عَلَى, which belong to the *cat.* of the *و*, but are pronounced with *Kasr* or *Damm* of the 1st, to be dualized with the *ي* (A).

§ 230. The *ns.* whose final is a Hamza are of 2

kinds, prolonged and unprolonged. The prolonged [229] is every *n.* whose final is a Hamza preceded by an *aug.* **ا**, as <sup>ا</sup>كَسَاء and <sup>ا</sup>رَدَاء [683, 723] (IY). The Hamza of the prolonged is [of 4 kinds (R)], (1) substituted for the **ا** of femininization, as <sup>ا</sup>حَمْرَاء [263]; (2) denotative of coordination, as <sup>ا</sup>عَلِيَاء [273]; (3) converted from a *rad.* [و or **ي** (R)], as <sup>ا</sup>كَسَاء [and <sup>ا</sup>حَيَاء (IA)]; (4) *rad.*, as <sup>ا</sup>قَرَاء (R, IA). The Hamza [substituted for the **ا** (IA, A)] of femininization is usually converted into و (R, IA, A), as <sup>ا</sup>حَمْرَآءِ (IA, A): and is rarely sounded true, as <sup>ا</sup>حَمْرَآءِ; or, [as Mb transmits from Mz (R),] converted into **ي**, as <sup>ا</sup>حَمْرَآئِ (R, A): but Sf asserts that, when its **ا** is preceded by a و, as <sup>ا</sup>عَشَوَاء, the Hamza must be sounded true, as <sup>ا</sup>عَشَوَآءِ, not <sup>ا</sup>عَشَوَآئِ, in order that 2 وs having only an **ا** between them may not be combined; and the KK in that case allow both methods (A). The *rad.* Hamza is [usually (R)] preserved [in the *du.* (R, A), as <sup>ا</sup>قَرَأَ and <sup>ا</sup>رَضَأَ (IA, A)]; but F transmits from some of the Arabs that it is converted into و, as <sup>ا</sup>قَرَأَ (R)]. The Hamza denotative of coordination, or converted from a *rad.* [و or **ي** (R, A)], may be converted into و, [as <sup>ا</sup>عَلِيَّآءِ and <sup>ا</sup>كَسَاوِآءِ (IA, A)]; or

preserved, [as عَلَبَّاءُ, كَسَّاءُ, and حَيَّاءُ (IA, A)]; but conversion is better in the Hamza denotative of co-ordination, and preservation in the one converted from a *rad.* (R, IA, A): so IM mentions, agreeably with the opinion of some; but S and Akh, followed by Jz, declare that preservation is better unrestrictedly, though S mentions that conversion is more frequent in the Hamza denotative of coordination than in the one converted from a *rad.*, while it is rare in both (A). The Hamza [substituted for a *rad.* (R)] is sometimes converted into ي, [as كَسَّاءُ (A)]; though this is anomalous (R, A), contrary to the opinion of Ks: and they treat ثَنَائِي as sound [721], because they convert only the final و or ي into Hamza after the ا, as كَسَّاءُ and رَدَّاءُ; whereas here the ي is not final, since the *sing.* is not used [228]. The 2 *augs.* of femininization [273] (R), the ا and Hamza (A), when they follow 4 or more letters (R), are sometimes elided [together (A)], as قَاصِعَانِ [and عَاشُورَانِ, by analogy قَاصِعَاوَانِ and عَاشُورَاوَانِ (A), because of the length (R)]; though this is anomalous (R, A), contrary to the opinion of the KK (R). The anomalies in the prolonged are 5, (1) حَمْرَاءَانِ, which, as Ns relates, is allowed by the KK; (2) حَمْرَائِيَانِ, which, as some relate, is the *dial.* of Fazāra; (3) قَاصِعَانِ, which

is held by the KK to be regular ; (4) كَسَايَانِ, which is held by Ks to be regular, and is transmitted by AZ from the *dial.* of Fazāra ; (5) قَرَارَانِ, though the language of some GG implies that it has not been heard (A). The unprolonged is every *n.* whose final is a Hamza not preceded by an ا, as رَشَا, حَدَا, and قَارِي; and it admits of only one method, vid. retention of the Hamza, as رَشَانِ, because the Hamza in it is *rad.* (IY).

§ 231. As for the *n.* [arbitrarily (R)] curtailed of its final, [it is of 2 kinds (IY) :—] (1) if the elided [ل (IY)] be restored in prothesis, as in أَب [16], أَخ, [حَم, and هَن (R),] it must be restored in the *du.* [also (R)], as أَبَوَانِ, أَخَوَانِ (IY, R), حَمَوَانِ, and هَنَوَانِ : (a) sometimes أَبَانِ and أَخَانِ are said (R) : (b) he that says هَنُك in prothesis says هَنَانِ in the *du.*, and he that says هَنُوك says هَنَوَانِ (IY) : (c) as for فُوك, the ل is not restored in the *du.*, as it is not restored in prothesis ; and the word is dualized only by conversion of its ل into م, as when it is not *pre.*, as فَمَانِ : but فَمَوَانِ occurs in poetry, as

هُمَا نَقْتَانِي فِي مَن فَمَوِيهِمَا \* عَلَى النَّابِغِ الْعَاوِي أَشَدَّ رِجَامِ

[by AlFarazdaq, *They two have spat into my mouth from their two mouths* (233) *a most severe reviling against the barker, the howler* (Dw)]; and فَمَيَّانٍ, which is stranger : (d) the ل of ذَاتُ is restored in the *du.*, not the ل of ذُو, as ذُرَاتَا مَالٍ; but ذَاتَا مَالٍ also occurs, though it is rare (R) : (2) if the [elided (IY)] ل be not restored in prothesis, as in [عُدَّ (R),] يَدُ, and دِم, it is not restored in the *du.* [also (R)], as يَدَانِ and دِمَانِ : (a) as for [يَدَيَّانِ in (R)] the saying of the poet

يَدَيَّانِ بَيْضَاوَانِ عِنْدَ مُحَلِّمٍ \* قَدْ تَمْنَعَانِي أَنْ تَضَامَ وَتُضْهِدَا

[*Two noble hands belonging to Muḥallim (a king of Al Yaman) do hinder thee from being wronged and oppressed* (AAz), it is explained by our school as rare and anomalous, and is held by them to be a poetic license ; but, in my opinion (IY)], it is according to the *dial.* of those who say يَدِي, [treating it as abbreviated (IY),] like رَحِي : (b) [similarly دِم is used abbreviated, so that (IY)] دِمَيَّانِ [or دِمَوَانِ (R)] is said, as in the saying of the poet [Mirdās Ibn ‘Amr, or, as is said AlAkḥṭal (IY), or Suḥaim Ibn Wathīl arRiyāḥī (N),]

فَلَوْ أَنَّا عَلَى حَجَرٍ ذُبَحْنَا \* جَرَى الدَّمِيَّانِ بِالْخَبَرِ الْيَقِينِ

(IY, R) *So that, if we were slaughtered on a single stone, the 2 bloods would flow apart with the certain tidings of enmity and hate* (IY): Jh says that its **ل** is a **و**, so that **دَمِيَانٍ** is anomalous according to him ; but Mb says that its **ل** is a **ي**, so that **دَمَوَانٍ** is anomalous according to him. But, as for the *n.* whose **ل** is elided for a necessitating cause, it is either abbreviated or defective [229] (R).

§ 232. The [*quasi-pl.*, or the broken, not being an ultimate (R),] *pl.* [228] is [allowed to be (R)] dualized according to the interpretation of [*two collections* or (M)] *two parties* : the poet says

لَنَا اِبْلَانٍ فِيهِمَا مَا عَلِمْتُمْ \* فَعَنْ اِيْهَا مَا شِئْتُمْ فَتَذَكُّبُوا

[*We have two herds of camels, wherein is what ye have known for the entertainment of guests. Then, from whichever of them ye will, shoulder what ye will, carrying it to your tents* (N), cited by AZ ; and in tradition is {the saying of the Prophet (IY)} **مَثَلُ الْمَنَافِقِ كَالشَّاةِ** **الْعَائِرَةِ** **بَيْنَ الْغَنَمَيْنِ** *The similitude of the hypocrite is like the sheep going to and fro between the two flocks* (M)] ; and the poet [‘Amr Ibn Al‘Addá (AAz)] says

لَأَصْبَحَ الْحَيُّ اَوْبَانًا وَلَمْ يَجِدُوا \* عِنْدَ الْفُرْقِ فِي الْهَيْجَا جَمَالَيْنِ

(M, R) By God (N), *the tribe would have become destitute, and would not have found upon dispersing in war 2 herds of he-camels* (AAz, N), so that it might sup-

port the burden of warlike expeditions (N), cited by AUd; and they say لَقَاحَانِ سَوْدَاوَانِ *Two herds of black milch-camels*, [quoted by S (IY)]; and Abu-nNajm [al'Ijlī (Jsh)] says, [describing a mare trained to war (N),]

تَبَقَّلْتُ فِي أَوَّلِ التَّبَقُّلِ \* بَيْنَ رِمَاحِي مَالِكٍ وَنَهْشَلِ

(M) *She grazed in the beginning of the grazing between the two clumps of spears of Mālik Ibn Dubai'a and Nahshal Ibn Dārim, 2 Chiefs of the Arabs (N).* This is easier in أَبْلَانِ, because أَبْلٌ, being a generic *n.*, is *sing.* [254], not a broken *pl.*, like جَمَالٌ (IY). But لَنَا مَسَاجِدَانِ is not allowed.

§ 233. When 2 parts are *pre.* in letter or sense to their 2 wholes, then, if the 2 wholes be uniform in letter, the *sing.* number in the *pre.* is better than the *du.*, as

كَانَتْ وَجْهَ تَرْكِيذَيْنِ قَدْ غَضِبَا

*As though it were the face of 2 Turks, who had become angry and* حَيَا اللَّهُ وَجْهًا لِلزَّيْدَيْنِ *God save a face of the 2 Zaid's !*, in the latter of which the prothesis is in sense; and the *pl.* is better than the *sing.*, as إِنَّ تَتَوْبَا إِلَى اللَّهِ *ان تَتَوْبَا إِلَى اللَّهِ* LXVI. 4. *If ye turn again unto God, your hearts have swerved*, [an address to Hafsa

and 'Ā'isha (K, B)]. That is because in *lit.* prothesis, which is frequently used, they dislike the combination of 2 *du.* united in letter by the prothesis, and in sense, since the intention is that the *pre.* should be part of the *post.*, while no ambiguity is produced by the omission of dualization ; and *id.* [prothesis] is made to accord with the *lit.* : but, if the omission lead to ambiguity, only the *du.* is allowable according to the KK, which is the truth [below], as you say

قَلَعْتُ عَيْنَيْهِمَا <sup>أَع</sup> I plucked out their two eyes, when you have plucked out an eye from each one ; while فَا قَطَعُوا <sup>أَع</sup>

أَيْدِيَهُمَا <sup>أَع</sup> V. 42. Cut off their hands means أَيْمَانَهُمَا <sup>أَع</sup> their right hands by tradition and common consent, and is so read by Ibn Mas'ūd, [for which reason the *pl.* may be put in place of the *du.*, as in LXVI. 4., because the dualization of the *post.* is deemed sufficient (B)]. And the *pl.* is preferred to the *sing.* because of its affinity to the *du.* in being an addition of a *sing.* to another thing [234]. S makes no distinction between the first's being single in each of the two [seconds], as in قُلُوبِكُمَا <sup>أَع</sup>, and its not being so, as in أَيْدِيَهُمَا <sup>أَع</sup>, relying upon the evidence of V. 42. ; but the truth is what the KK hold [above], vid. that the *pl.* in the like of it is not allowable except with a plain indication, as in the text. The 2 idioms are combined in the saying [of Khīṭām alMujāshī'ī, says S, or Himyān Ibn Kuḥāfa, says F (FA),]



وَمَهْمَيْنِ قَدَفَيْنِ مَرَّتَيْنِ \* ظَهَرَاهُمَا مِثْلَ ظَهْرِ التَّرْسَيْنِ  
جَعْتَهُمَا بِالْزَعَةِ لَا بِالزَعَتَيْنِ

[*And many two deserts distant, bare of vegetation, whose 2 backs were like the backs of 2 bucklers, have I come to by the single description, not by the two descriptions! , i. e. have I traversed by hearing that road described a single*

*time! (AAz, N); and the o. f. is used in هُمَا نَفَثَا الْخُ (231)*

*(AAz)]. If, however, the 2 wholes be separated by a con., the sing. is preferred to the du. and pl., as نَفْسٌ زَيْدٌ*

*وَعَمْرُو The person of Zaid and 'Amr, in order that the apparent pre. may agree [in number] with the apparent post. : and, if the pre. be not part of the post., but they be separate, then, if there be danger of ambiguity, as in*

*لَقِيتُ غُلَامِي الزَّيْدَيْنِ I met the 2 menservants of the 2 Zaid,*

*the pre. must be in the du.; whereas, if there be no danger, it may be regularly in the pl., agreeably with the opinion of Fr and Y, contrary to the opinion of others,*

*who allow it as matter of hearsay, as in ضَعَّ رِحَالَهُمَا*

*Put down their saddles, where there is no danger of ambiguity, because 2 camels have only 2 saddles. In the pron. relating to every n. that we have mentioned, whose letter differs from its sense, the letter or sense*

*may be observed, as نَفْسُكَمَا أَعْجَبَتْنِي or أَعْجَبَتَانِي The*

*persons of you two pleased me* ; and similarly in the *qual.*, *dem.*, and the like (R). The *sing.* sometimes occurs in the place of (1) the *du.* (R, BS), in the case of those 2 things which accompany one another and do not separate, like the *two legs* and *two eyes*, as *عَيْنِي لَا تَنَامُ* *Mine eye sleeps not* (R), whence

أَلَا إِنَّ عَيْنًا لَمْ تَجِدْ يَوْمَ وَاسِطٍ \* عَلَيْكَ بِجَارِي دُمْعَاهَا لَجَمُودٍ

(BS), by Abū 'Atá asSindī, lamenting Ibn Hubaira, *Now, verily an eye that lavished not its flowing tears over thee, O Ibn Hubaira, on the day of thy death at Wāsīt, was indeed niggardly* (FD) ; and approximate to it is

وَعَيْنَايَ فِي رَوْضٍ مِنَ الْحَسَنِ تَرْتَعُ

*And my two eyes revel in gardens of beauty*, [for *تَرْتَعَانِ*]:

(2) the *pl.*, [when there is no danger of ambiguity (K on II. 6),] as *وَيَكُونُونَ عَلَيْهِمْ ضِدًّا* XIX. 85. *And they shall be adversaries to them*, whence

كَلُوا فِي بَعْضِ بَطْنِكُمْ تَعْفُوا \* فَإِنَّ زَمَانَكُمْ زَمَنُ خَمِيصٍ

[316] (R) *Eat ye in part of your bellies* : [if ye eat little (AAz),] *ye will be abstinent. For verily your time is a hungry time* (AAz, N), i. e. *بَطُونَكُمْ* (SL), and *الْوَارِدُونَ*

*دَتِيمٌ* [18] with *جُلْدٌ* in the *sing.* (N). Conversely the *du.* acts as a substitute for the *sing.*, as

فَجَعَلْنَ مَدَنَ عَاقِلَيْنِ أَيَاْمَنَا \* وَجَعَلْنَ أَمْعَزَ رَامَتَيْنِ شَمَالًا

*Then they put the watercourse of 'Akil on the rights, and put the hard ground of Rāmatān on the left, i. e.*

عَاقِلٍ, which is a *mountain*; and Fr allows وَلَمْنُ خَافَ

مَقَامَ رَبِّهِ جَنَّاتٍ LV. 46. *And he that feareth the bar of*

*his Lord shall have a garden to be an instance of this; and IKhz states in the Nihāya [fi-nNahw (HKh)] that*

*they say مَاتَ حَتْفَ أَنْفَيْهِ He died [a natural death, literally] the death of his nose, [orig. He died upon his bed, and his soul came forth from his nose (Md),] and that*

يَا حَبْدَا عَيْنَا سَلِيمَى وَالْفَمَا

*O most lovely are the two eyes of Sulaimā and the mouth*

*is an instance of this construction, the o. f. being وَالْفَمَايِ,*

*and the ف elided by poetic license [228] (BS): and أَفْعَلًا*

*sometimes acts as a substitute for أَفْعَلُ, as L. 23. [193],*

*either because dualization of the ag. is made a substitute for repetition of the v., as XXIII. 101. [598, 607] is explained; or because most travelling-companions are 3 in number, and each of them usually addresses his 2 companions, so that a single person also is addressed as two, because their tongues are accustomed to it (R). The pl. sometimes occurs in the place of the [sing. or (R)]*

*du.* (R, BS), a synecdoche being meant to be understood, as *جَبَّ مَذَاكِيرُهُ* *He cut off his penis* and *قَطَعَ اللَّهُ خَصَالَهُ* *God cut off his testicles !* (R) ; and the substitution of the *sing.* and *pl.* for the *du.* are combined in the saying of the Hudhali [Abù Dhu'aib (N)]

فَا لَعَيْنَ بَعْدَهُمْ كَانَ حَدَاتُهَا \* سَمِلَتْ بِشَوْكِ فُهِى عَوْدِ تَدْمَعُ

*Then the eye after the death of them is as though its blacks were put out with thorns, so that they are blind, shedding tears* (BS).



P. 456, l. 8. Read “*ep.*”

P. 461, l. 7. This Khālid was the cousin of Abū Dhu’aib (Is, Jsh).

P. 464, l. 3. The majority, however, hold that عَمِيَّةٌ is curtailed, being constructively عَمِيَّةٌ: and that afterwards the ʾ is interpolated, without being reckoned [as the ʾ of feminization (Sn)]; and is pronounced with Fatḥ, because it occurs in the place of what requires Fatḥ, vid. what precedes the ʾ of feminization elided, but understood (A)—  
l. l. By AlḤuṭai’a (IY).

P. 465, l. 20. It is named *subst.* in the conventional language of the BB: and, as for the KK, Akh says that they name it *interpretation* [of what is meant by the *ant.* (Sn)], and *explanation* [of it (Sn)]; while IK says that they name it *repetition* (A) of what is meant by the *ant.*; but the propriety of these 3 names is not evident in the case of the *subst.* distinct [from the *ant.*] (Sn).

P. 468, l. 17. Because the enunciative *prop.* would remain without a *rel.* (IY).

P. 469, ll. 6-7. By AlAkhtal (Akh).

P. 470, l. 11. Cited by Mz (MAd).

P. 471, l. 18. After “*Zaid*” insert “[160]”.

P. 472, l. 7. عَمِيَّةٌ relates to عَمِيَّةٌ, being the *cop.* [27], according to R’s theory as to the *op.* of the *subst.* [131].

P. 473, l. 5. He satirized AlḤajjāj (T)—l. 10. A heathen poet (FA).

P. 474, l. 1. Read “*Kuraish*”.

P. 476, l. 11. Read “*Sa’id*”.

P. 478, l. 17. عَمِيَّةٌ in lexicology is *Reversion to the thing after departure from it* (Sn)—l. 18. This *appos.* is named عَمِيَّةُ الْبَيَانِ because the speaker *reverts* to, and *manifests*, the *ant.* by means of it (Sn).

P. 479, l. 2. The Khalifa Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Umar Ibn AlKhaṭṭāb alKuraishī al‘Adawī alMadanī, a. 13, k. 23 (NW).

P. 480, l. 1. But here the *synd. expl.* is not a *prim.*

P. 481, l. 13. Bishr Ibn ‘Amr, of the Banū Bakr Ibn Wā’il (AΔz).

P. 486, l. 1. بَعْضُ is governed in the *acc.* by an understood *v.* indicated by كَفَرًا, as though he said كَفَرًا بَعْضُ (T).

P. 489, l. 2. For “his” read “His”—l. 3. Read “because (MAIH)”.

P. 492, l. 14. Maslama Ibn Dhuhl, Zayyāba being his mother (Jsh), one of the Banū Taim Allāh Ibn Tha‘āba (IAth), a heathen poet—l. 15. AlḤārith Ibn Hammām ashShaibānī (T, Jsh).

P. 494, l. 17. Read “Umar”.

P. 499, l. 18. R adds “being a verbal *n.*” to the preventives of inflection in order to account for the uninflectedness of those verbal *ns.* which resemble the *aor.* (see p. 653, l. 7—p. 654, l. 1).

P. 501, ll. 18-20. That the verbal *ns.* are *uninfl.* is not disputed, though three different reasons are given at pp. 653-654 for their being so. The validity of the reason here given, vid. that they resemble the *p.* in not being impressible by the *op.*, is based upon the theory that they have no place in inflection, i.e. do not occupy the place of a *n.* in any case, which is disputed (see p. 658).

P. 503, l. 7. Some of the BB, according to R (see p. 743, l. 19)—l. 16. Abū Ṣakhr ‘Abd Allāh Ibn Sālim asSahmī alHudhailī, an Islāmī poet of the Umayyad dynasty (AKB). The Banū Sahm were his tribe (T)—l. 19. By Mirbāl Ibn Jahm alMadhhijī (MN, FA, Jsh) or Mubashshir Ibn AlHudhail alFazārī (MN).

P. 506, l. 2. On the name “*met.*” see p. 823, ll. 9-10.

P. 508, l. 4. خَلِيلِي [with reduplication (Jsh) of the final ي] is the [perf. masc.] pl. [of خَلِيل (EC)] pre. to the ي of the 1st per. sing. (EC, Jsh).

P. 510, l. 1. The 2nd hemistich is given in *IY.* 10 and 84 as

وَهَذَا أَتَى مِنْ دُونِهَا الْغَايَ وَالْبَعْدَ

And *Hind*, *farness and distance* have come in front of her, i.e., between me and her—l. 15. Or, as is said, his son Sawāda Ibn ‘Adī (AKB).

P. 517, l. 20. <sup>ط</sup>ط is abbreviated (MN, FA, N), by poetic license (FA, N), because its *o. f.* is <sup>ط</sup>ططط with the Hamza (MN).

P. 518, l. 8. For “XXVIII” and “611” read “XXVII” and “612”.

P. 521, l. 8. <sup>ط</sup>ط Humaid or <sup>ط</sup>ط praiseworthy. The verse is attributed to Humaid Ibn Huraith Ibn Baḥdal [alKalbī (IAth)], of the Banū Kalb Ibn Wabra, whose pedigree reaches to Kuḍā’a. Humaid was an Islāmī poet; and Maisūn Bint Baḥdal, the mother of Yazid Ibn Mu’āwiya, was his paternal aunt (AKB). <sup>ط</sup>ط (IY. 414).

P. 523, l. 3. I.e. <sup>ط</sup>ط. The verse is by AlMukhallab alHilālī, of whose pedigree and history I know nothing; and has been plagiarized by Al‘Ujair asSalūlī alHilālī, a freedman of the Banū Hilāl, whose name was ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd Allāh, a minor Islāmī poet of the Umawī dynasty. Sgh says “The piece is Lāmīya; but <sup>ط</sup>ط occurs in the Book of S in place of <sup>ط</sup>ط tractable, and the GG have followed him in the mistranscription” (AKB)—l. 7. Hamdān is a tribe of AlYamau (AKB).

P. 531, ll. 17-18. An elegant, excellent poet of the Umawī dynasty (AKB). ‘Abd AlMalik Ibn Marwān asked him for his daughter in marriage for one of his sons (Mb). The Khalifa ‘Abd AlMalik Ibn Marwān [alKurashī alUmawī, b. 26 (ITB), a. 65 (MDh), d. 86 (MDh, ITB)]. He was proclaimed Khalifa in succession to his father Marwān Ibn AlḤakam after ‘Abd Allāh Ibn AzZubair had laid claim to the Khilāfa; and his undisputed Khilāfa, i. e. after the slaughter of ‘Abd Allāh Ibn AzZubair, was from the middle of 73 (ITB). The Khalifa Marwān Ibn AlḤakam alKurashī alUmawī, [nephew and (Nw, ITB)]



private (TKh)] secretary of 'Uthmān [Ibn 'Aflān (Nw, ITB), *l.* 2, (Nw), *a* 64 (ITB, TKH)], *d.* 65 (Nw, ITB, TKh). Ibn AzZubair was proclaimed Khalifa (AGh, Is, TKh) at Makka (TKh) in 64 (Is, TKh) in the days of Yazid Ibn Mu'āwiya (TKh), [or] after the death of Yazid (AGh, Is) Ibn Mu'āwiya (Is); or in 64 or 65 after the death of Mu'āwiya Ibn Yazid (TKh).

*P.* 534, *l.* 4. <sup>وَالشَّرَّ</sup> <sup>إِيَّاكَ</sup> as an *ex.* of detachment caused by suppression of the *op.* is appropriate only when the *op.* is supplied before the *pron.*; for, when the *op.* is supplied after the *pron.*, it is an *ex.* of detachment caused by precedence of the *pron.* before its *op.* (see *l.* 19 and the Note on *p.* 196, *l.* 18).

*P.* 535, *l.* 3. Abū Bakr aṣṢiddīq said to the Apostle of God (God bless him and give him peace!) "Teach me a supplication wherewith I may supplicate [God] in my prayer." He said, Say <sup>اللَّهُمَّ</sup> <sup>أَنْتَ</sup> <sup>ظَلَمْتُ</sup>

<sup>نَفْسِي</sup> <sup>ظَلَمْتُ</sup> <sup>كَثِيرًا</sup> <sup>وَلَا</sup> <sup>يَغْفِرُ</sup> <sup>الذُّنُوبَ</sup> <sup>إِلَّا</sup> <sup>أَنْتَ</sup> <sup>فَاغْفِرْ</sup> <sup>لِي</sup> <sup>مَغْفِرَةً</sup> <sup>مِنْ</sup> <sup>عِنْدِكَ</sup>  
<sup>وَارْحَمْنِي</sup> <sup>إِنَّكَ</sup> <sup>أَنْتَ</sup> <sup>الْغَفُورُ</sup> <sup>الرَّحِيمُ</sup> *O God, verily I have done much*

*wrong against mine own soul; and not (any) forgiveth sins but Thou. Wherefore forgive Thou me of Thy grace, and have mercy upon me. Verily Thou, Thou art the very forgiving, the Merciful* (SB. I. 214)—*l.* 9.

Properly <sup>أَنْفُسًا</sup> [446] (AKB) — *l.* 10. He was named Dhu-l-Iṣba' because a serpent bit his *finger* (ID, AKB), so that it withered away. He is said to have lived 270 years; and AHm says that he lived 300 years. And he was one of the judges of the Arabs in heathenism (AKB). The question of 'Abd AlMalik Ibn Marwān "Who is he?" in Tr. II. 815 and IATH. IV. 270 (see the Note on *p.* 44, *l.* 11), to which Ma'bad Ibn Khālīd alJadālī answered "He is Dhu-l-Iṣba'", did not refer to the man put forward by 'Adwān as their spokesman with the Khalifa, but to the author of the verses quoted by 'Abd AlMalik, as is clear from the *var.* "Who says this?" in Tr. II. 815, note *k*, and AKB, II. 409. Cf.

KA. III. 3—l. 11. Bk says (AKB), Kurrà is a place in the countries of the Banu-Iḥārith (Bk, AKB) Ibn Ka'b (AKB).

P. 542, l. 19. A heathen [poet (FA, AKB)], lamenting his brother Uṭait, and complaining of two companions of his, who were harassing him, said to be his two nephews Mudrik and Murra (MN, FA, AKB) : so says Al'Ainī (AKB).

P. 543, ll. 19—20. Attributed by the commentators of the Book of S to 'Umar Ibn Abī Rabi'a; but by [AFI,] the author of the KA, who is followed by [Jh,] the author of the Ṣiḥāḥ, to Al'Arjī (AKB)—ll. 23-24. The author of <sup>أَلْحَ</sup>عَدَدْتُ قَوْمِي is [not Ibn Duraid, but] Ru'ba (MN, FA, EC, AKB) Ibn Al'Ajjāj (MN).

P. 544, l. 4. He said that of a man who was mentioned to him as intending to do him harm (IY).

P. 545, l. 10. The Persian *ed.* of the ML (*p.* 253, l. 16) has <sup>أَلْسَكُنْ</sup>لَسَكُنْ; but the 2 Egyptian *eds.*, the DM (*vol.* II., *p.* 279) and Amr (*vol.* II., *p.* 223), have the form given in the text.

P. 546, ll. 20-22. These are the annullers of inchoation [24] The *vs.* of *app.* are omitted, because their *pred.* is an *aor. v.* [459] ; and the generic *neg.* <sup>لَا</sup>لَا, because its *sub.* and *pred.* are *indet.* [100].

P. 549, ll. 13-14. Muhammad Ibn Marwān [Ibn AlḤakam, brother of the Khalifa 'Abd AlMalik (IATH, ITB)], one of the Readers of AlMadīna, [*d.* 101 (IATH) or 102 (ITB)]. IAl says "Ibn Marwān wraps himself up in his solecism", i.e. by making the distinctive occur between the *d. s.* and *s. s.* (R)—l. 15. Zaid Ibn 'Alī [Zain al'Ābidīn (ITB)] Ibn alḤusain Ibn 'Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib alHāshimī [alMadanī, *b.* 80 (IHjr)], *z.* [121 (IKb, MDh, MAB, TKh), 122 (IKb, MDh, IATH, MAB, IHjr, ITB), or ] 123 at the age of [42 (MAB) or] 44 (FW).

P. 555, l. 10. Ibn Abi-l'Āṣ athThaḡaffī alBaṣrī, the celebrated poet, reproving his cousin 'Abd ArRaḥmān Ibn 'Uthmān Ibn Abi-l'Āṣ (AKB).

P. 556, l. 2. D. 84 (Is, IHjr, AKB) : *d.* 89 (ITB).

P. 557, l. 9. By Ṣakhr Ibn AlJa'd alMuḥārībī alKhudrī, an elegant poet contemporary with the Umawī and 'Abbāsī dynasties (KA). The forms العود or العبود and الحضرى in the MN. II. 227, FA. 95, SM. 197, and Jsh, seem to be erroneous—7. 10. Ṣakhr Ibn AlJa'd was enamoured of Ka's, daughter of Bujair Ibn Juḍab (KA) ; not, as Lane supposes (p. 2049, col. 1), "of El-Kelḥabeh El-'Oranee".

P. 559, l. 5. Shadan is a place in AlYaman (Bk).

P. 561, l. 7. Zaid Ibn Muḥalhil aṭṬā'ī anNabhānī, known as Zaid AlKhail, who came to the Prophet with the embassy from Ṭayyī in the year 9, and was named by the Prophet Zaid AlKhair. He was a good poet. On his departure from the Prophet, he was seized with fever ; and, when he reached his family, he died ; but some say that he died at the end of the Khilāfa of 'Umar (AGh)—l. 16. ẖais is the father of a tribe of Muḍar (AKB, J) called ẖais 'Ailān, a prothetic comp., [meaning *The ẖais of 'Ailān*] (AKB)—l. 19. Ḥumaid Ibn Mālik.....Ibn Zaid Manāt Ibn Tamīm, an Islāmī poet of the Umawī dynasty, contemporary with AlḤajjāj. He was named AlArḳaṭ [*The spotted or speckled*] because of some marks that were on his face (AKB). Jh says the verse is by Ḥumaid (MN, FA) ; but IY says (MN, FA, AKB) it is by Abū Baḥdala (IY, MN, FA, AKB), whom I do not know (AKB).

P. 562, l. l. See an *ex.* of the 2nd prevailing over the 3rd in p. 125, ll. 14-16.

P. 575, l. 3. Ka'b Ibn Sa'd alGhanawī, an Islāmī poet, and apparently a Follower (AKB)—l. 19. Lane's assertion that هَا is not prefixed to the *du.* of ذَاكَ (p. 947, col. 3) is refuted by what IY says here ; and his assertion that هَا is not prefixed to اُولَٰئِكَ (p. 947, col. 3), and that one does not say هَاوَلَٰئِكَ or the like (p. 86, col. 3), is refuted by the verse at l. 15 and by Al'Arjī's verse at p. 564, where the *dim.* of هَاوَلَٰئِكَ appears.

P. 576, ll. 12-14. هَا has 3 *dial. vars.*, هَا, هَا, and هَا (IY. 337). They are all of one sense, vid. demonstration of *place* ; but they differ

in *nearness* and *distance*, the *near places* being demonstrated by هه with Damm, and the *distant* by the 2 others (MN, FA)—l. 21. Read ارجائها and “on its,” the *pron.* referring to the هه trackless waste mentioned in the verse preceding.

P. 580, l. 6. This verse is cited by Skr in the DH as (AKB) by a man of Hudhail (DH, AKB). It belongs to the same poem as the lines cited in *vol.* II, p. 717, ll. 11-12 and in the Note thereon at p. 29A. Numerous *vars.* of this verse and of the verses cited in p. 579, ll. 16-17 and p. 580, l. 3 are given in the AKB. Read تزي—l. 10. The Lucknow *ed.* of the R gives لا تعوذ ; but the Teheran *ed.* has لا تعوذ is not charmed, which seems more appropriate. The Delhi *ed.* gives no vowels—ll. 23-24. According to R, اى is made *det.* by its expressed or constructive prefixion to a *det.*, not by its *conj.* (p. 586, ll. 13-15).

P. 582, l. 13. Al‘Aini says (AKB) it is by AlAkhtal (MN, FA, AKB); but I have searched diligently through his *Dīwān* without finding it (AKB). This poet was given the cognomen of AlAkhtal because of the *bigness of his ears* (MN, FA): [but various other reasons are stated in the KA and AKB]. He was a Christian (KA, FA), of the people of AlḤira (KA); and he belongs to the 1st class of Islāmī poets (KA, MN, FA). He lived a long life until he went to Hell-fire (AKB)—l. 1. The saying of the Banū ‘Uqail or Hudhail جاء الذر ن قاسوا They that stood came (BS).

P. 583, l. 2. Its author is Ru‘ba Ibn Al‘Ajjaḥ: but is said by AZ and IAr to be a heathen man of the Banū ‘Uqail; though they differ about his name, which AZ says is Abū Ḥarb AlA‘lam, while IAr says something else. And Sgh says that the author is Lailā alAkhyaliyya (MN).

P. 583, l. 20. معاط with Tanwīn from regard to its being a name of a مكان place (AKB). Either form suits the metre—ll. The verse is by Umayya Ibn AlAskar, or, as is said by [ID and] the author of the

KA, Ibn Hurrthān Ibn Al'Askar [or Al'ashkar (AGh, Is)], alKinānī [al-Laithi alJundā'i (AGh, Is)], a converted poet (AKB).

P. 584, l. 1. 'Ukāz, Majanna, and Dhu-lMajāz were markets for Makka in the time of heathenism. 'Ukāz is a level plain. AU says (Bk), 'Ukāz is between Nakhlā and Aṭṭā'if (Bk, ZJ, MI), one night's journey from Aṭṭā'if and 3 from Makka (MI). It was taken as a market 15 years after [the year of] the Elephant, [in which the Apostle of God was born (SR, Tr, LM),] and was abandoned for ever in the year 129 (Bk). The market of 'Ukāz used to open on [the morning of (Bk)] the 1st of Dhu-lKī'da, and last 20 days (Bk, ZJ)—ll. By a man of [the Banū (MN, FA)] Sulaim (MN, FA, EC).

P. 585, l. 20. Coptic by origin, freedman of the family of AzZubair Ibn Al'Awwām, b. 115 [or 120 (HH)], d. 197 (Syt).

P. 587, l. 9. Kais Ibn Jirwa (ID, T, AKB), a heathen poet (AKB), named 'Ārik because of this verse (T, AKB)—l. 15. An Islāmī poet of the Marwānī dynasty (AKB)—l. 20. Whence

قَوْلًا لِهَذَا الْمَرْدُ ذُو جَاءٍ سَاعِيًا \* هَلَمْ فَإِنَّ الْمَشْرِفِي الْفَرَاتِشِ

(R), by Kawwāl atṬā'i (T, AKB), an Islāmī poet, who lived at the end of the Umawī, and reached the 'Abbāsī dynasty, *Say ye two to this man, who has come collecting the poor-rate, Come on; for verily the sword* (called الْمَشْرِفِي in relation to the Mashārif, which were certain towns where swords used to be forged) *is with us instead of the camels fit to be taken in payment of the poor-rate* (AKB). The Mashārif were near Ḥaurān: Buṣrā was one of them (MI).

P. 588, ll. 18-19. Then he [the Fazāri mentioned in the story told in the Note to p. 845, l. 18] said to one of them, whose name was Mir-kama "Eat of it"; but he refused. Then he smote him, and cut off his head. Then said the other "Mir-kama has perished!". Then said the Fazāri <sup>هَلْ تَلْعَمُهُ</sup> وَأَنْتَ إِنْ لَمْ تَلْعَمُهُ And thou if thou swallow it not! IHb says "He



فَإِنْ أَدْعِ اللّٰوَاتِيَّ مِنْ أَنْاسٍ \* إِضَاعَوْهُنَّ لَا أُدْعِ الَّذِينَ

(R), by AlKumait Ibn Zaid, satirizing Kahtān, i.e. the tribes of AlYā-t man, *Then, if I spare to satirize those women (that) are of, i.e. dependent upon, men that have neglected, i.e. have not protected, them, I will not spare those men (that have neglected them), the conj. of اللّٰوَاتِيَّ being مِنْ أَنْاسٍ, i.e. مِنْ أَنْاسٍ, while the conj. of الَّذِينَ is suppressed, because indicated by the previous mention of it [in إِضَاعَوْهُنَّ ep. of أَنْاسٍ, which is part of the preceding conj.], the full phrase being الَّذِينَ إِضَاعَوْهُنَّ (AKB), and*

مِنْ اللّٰوَاتِيَّ وَالَّتِي وَاللّٰتِي \* زَعَمْنَ أَنِّي كَبُرْتُ لِدَاتِي

(R) *From those women (that have asserted etc.), and (from) that woman (that has asserted etc.), and (from) those women that have asserted that I, verily my contemporaries have grown old, the conj. of the first two conjuncts being suppressed, because indicated by the conj. of the third (AKB)—l. 7. Addressing Imra alKais Ibn Hujr alKindi (Jsh)—l. 17. ISh says, اللّٰتِيَّ and اللَّتِيَّ are made fem. here because اللَّاعِيَةُ calamity is fem. (AKB). They are [proper (Md)] names for [Great and Small (T)] Calamity, and therefore dispense with the conj., [and are transferred from being conjuncts (T),] as*

وَلَقَدْ رَأَيْتُ نَأْيَ الْعِشِيرَةِ بَيْنَهَا \* وَكُفَيْتُ جَانِبَيْهَا اللَّتِيَّ وَاللّٰتِيَّ

\* (T, Md), by Sulmī [or Salmā (AKB)] Ibn Rabi'a [asSidi (AKB)], of the Banu-sSid [Ibn Mālik Ibn Bakr Ibn Sa'd (AKB)] Ibn Dabba (T, AKB), a heathen poet, *And assuredly I have reconciled the discord of the community among themselves, and have sufficed its wrong-doer against the great and small calamity that he has brought upon himself (AKB) ; but some say that their conj. are suppressed, because indicated by [the circumstances of] the case (T).*

P. 605, l. 1. By Al'Uryān Ibn Sahla alJarmī, a heathen poet. This verse is one of three verses cited by AZ in his *Navādir*; but his version is not like that of the majority (AKB). The other two verses are the 1st and 4th of the poem by Al'Uryān cited at p. 712 of the T and p. 181 of the Calcutta *ed.* of the *Hamāsa*, where the unmeaning words <sup>لِسَهْلَةٍ وَذَمٍّ</sup> after <sup>بَنِي سَهْلَةَ الْجَرَمِيِّ</sup> <sup>وَقَالَ الْعَرِيَّانُ</sup> seem to be a mistranscription for <sup>بَنِي سَهْلَةَ الْجَرَمِيِّ</sup>. This verse, which is the 3rd in AZ's version, is not given in either *ed.* of the *Hamāsa*—l. 5. F says that <sup>الَّذِي</sup> here may signify (1) *the Ka'ba*, being made *masc.* as meaning <sup>الْبَيْتِ</sup> *the House*, in which case the [*acc.*] *pron.* in <sup>حَجٍّ</sup> is suppressed, because this *v.* is *trans.*, as is shown by the text <sup>فَمَنْ حَجَّ الْبَيْتَ أَوْ اعْتَمَرَ</sup> II. 153. *Then whoso performeth the pilgrimage to the House, or visiteth it*; and the sense is <sup>الَّذِي حَجَّ حَاتِمٌ</sup> *that (which) Hātīm has performed the pilgrimage to*: (2) *God*, in which case the full phrase is <sup>الَّذِي حَجَّ لَهُ حَاتِمٌ</sup> *Him (that) Hātīm has performed the pilgrimage (for the sake of)*. But IJ says on

<sup>رَدِيقُ أَنَّى وَمَا حَجَّ الْحَجَّاجُ لَهُ \* وَمَا أَهْلُ بَجْنَنِي نَخْلَةُ الْحَرَمِ</sup>

[by Ziyād Ibn Ḥamal, or Ibn Munḳidh, one of the Bal 'Adawiya, of the Banū Tamīm (T)], *Ruwaḳa, verily I, I swear by that House which the pilgrims perform the pilgrimage to, or by that House (which) the pilgrims perform the pilgrimage to for the sake of obedience to Him, i.e. God, and by the raising of the shout <sup>لَبَّيْكَ</sup> [115] *on the two sides of Nakhlā, [a place near the city of the Prophet (11) (T),] by the enterers into the Sacred territory, the 2nd مَا being infinitival, that, when the 1st مَا is held to be an expression for the House, the x in لَهُ may denote (1) the House, لَهُ being i.q. إِلَيْهِ, as in XCIX. 5. [504], i.e. لَيْسَ, [as though he said أَفْسَمَ (T)]; (2) God, i.e. بِالْبَيْتِ الَّذِي حَجَّ إِلَيْهِ الْحَجَّاجُ وَبِأَهْلِ الْحَرَمِ <sup>حَجَّ</sup>. Thus it is known that R's language is [derived from] one of F's 2 explanations, <sup>الَّذِي</sup> being con-**



strued to signify *God* (AKB). But, if so, R would supply <sup>ل</sup> instead of <sup>ل</sup> : and I think that he construes <sup>ل</sup> to signify *the House*, but supplies <sup>ل</sup> in accordance with the construction <sup>ل</sup> allowed by IJ and T—l. l. Ya'sur or A'sur was father of a tribe, that Bāhila belonged to (MN). See p. 27A.

P. 616, l. 22. The Banū Khalaf were AzZibriḳān's kinsfolk, Khalaf being his great-grandfather, because he was AzZibriḳān Ibn Badr Ibn Imra alḲais Ibn Khalaf.....Ibn Sa'd Ibn Zaid Manāt Ibn Tamīm (AKB).

P. 617, l. 10. Hudba was an elegant superior poet from the desert of AlḤijāz (AKB). He had killed Ziyāda Ibn Zaid al'Udhri; and, when he was carried to Mu'āwiya, 'Abd ArRaḥmān, brother of Ziyāda Ibn Zaid, advanced with him, and prosecuted him. Then said Mu'āwiya to him, "What sayest thou?" He said "Likest thou that the answer be in poetry or prose?" He said "Nay, in poetry; for verily it is pleasantor." Then said Hudba (Mb). Here follow some verses, of which this is one.

P. 618, l. 6. Praising AlJarrah Ibn 'Abd Allāh [alḤakamī (IATH, ITB)], Governor of Khurāsān. He was Commander of AlBaṣra, and afterwards became Governor of Armenia. He penetrated into the lands of the Khazar, and was martyred there (Dw) in 112 (IATH, ITB)—ll. 14-15. Ḳaṣīr Ibn Sa'd (ID, IATH, KF) of Lakhm (ID, IATH) Ibn 'Adī (ID). See Md. II. 123 and P. II. 450.

P. 621, l. 18. Māwiya is one of the names of women, among them Māwiya, the wife of Ḥatīm of Ṭayyi; and this verse is similar to his poetry, but I have not known it attributed to him (AKB). It is not in his *Dīwān* as given in the FDw.

P. 622, l. 18. Ḥatīm Ibn 'Abd Allāh atṬā'i, celebrated for his munificence, and one of the poets of heathenism (AKB).

P. 623, l. 16. And <sup>ل</sup> is transmitted (ML). This verse is part of a *Dālīya* ode by Ḥassān Ibn Thābit (MN, AKB) al Anṣārī (MN) aṣṢalābī: but its rhyme has been perverted by IJ, who transmist

فِي دَمَانٍ; and he is followed by many, among them IHsh in the ML, who says "And دَمَانٍ is like مَادٍ, in measure and meaning" (AKB)—*l.* 17. Ibn Dirār, cousin and contemporary of Zaid alFawāris Ibn Ḥuṣain Ibn Dirār adDabbī (T. 279), who was a heathen (AKB)—*l.* 18. Ath says that Ḥassān composed this poem upon Rufai' Ibn Ṣaifi Ibn 'Ābid, who was killed as an unbeliever on the day of Badr (AKB) in the year 2 (Tr, LM, TKh)—*l.* 23. The poets called AlKumait are 3 of the Banū Asad Ibn Khuzaima, (1) AlKumait alAkbar Ibn Tha'laba..... Ibn Jaḥwān Ibn Faḫ'as [Ibn Ṭarīf.....Ibn AlḤārith Ibn Tha'laba Ibn Dūdān Ibn Asad Ibn Khuzaima alAsadī, a Convert, says AU, as AlMarzubānī mentions (Is)]; (2) AlKumait Ibn Ma'rūf Ibn AlKumait alAkbar [alFaḫ'asī, a Convert, says AlMarzubānī (Is)]; (3) AlKumait Ibn Zaid.....Ibn Sa'd Ibn Tha'laba Ibn Dūdān Ibn Asad (AKB), a poet of the Umawī dynasty, *d.* 122 (Is) [or] 126 (ITB). The verses at *p.* 616 of *vol.* II. and *pp.* 297 and 367 of this *vol.* are all from one ode by AlKumait Ibn Zaid alAsadī (MN. III. 111); and the verse at *p.* 112 of this *vol.* is by the same poet (MN. I. 534): while the verses at *pp.* 623 and 712 of *vol.* II. are by AlKumait Ibn Ma'rūf (MN. IV. 109, 320, Jsh); though IAr says that the last verse is by AlKumait Ibn Tha'laba alFaḫ'asī (MN. IV. 321).

*P.* 624, *l.* 20. *D.* [104 (Nw),] 105 (IKb, IATH, IKhn, Nw, TH), 106 (IKhn, Nw, TH), 107 (IKhn, Nw, TH, IHjr, TKh), 108 (ITB), or 115 (IKhn), at the age of 80 (IKb, IKhn) or 84 (IKhn)—*l.* 23. *D.* 156 (IHjr). Not [to be confounded with 'Isā Ibn 'Umar] athThaḫāfi, the Baṣī Grammarian, who also is one of the leading Readers (DM).

*P.* 625, *l.* 3. The last word is الْقَيْلُ <sup>speech</sup>, which Dm has mis-spelt الْقَيْلُ <sup>slaughter</sup>. The verse is from an ode composed by Ka'b Ibn Mālik, poet of the Apostle of God, in answer to 2 pieces that Ibn AzZibā'ra and 'Amr Ibn Al'Āṣ had glorified themselves with on the day of Uḥud (AKB) in the year 3 (Tr, IATH, LM). Ka'b Ibn Mālik [aṣṢaḥābī (Nw)] alAnṣārī (Agh, Nw, AKB) alKhazrajī asSalamī (AGh, Nw), of the Banū Salima (AGh) Ibn Sa'd (IHb, Dh) Ibn 'Alī.....Ibn AlKhazraj (IHb),



P. 639, l. 8-9. See the 2nd explanation in the Note on p. 169, l. 17, where the qualified, when treated as compounded with the *qual.* into one *n.*, is considered to be *uninfl.* upon Fath, not *infl.* in the *acc.*, as R here says.

P. 640, l. 7. The disconnection is produced by the repetition of <sup>أ</sup>ج, which makes a fresh *prop.*

P. 643, l. 15. Naṣr Ibn Sayyār, governor of Khurāsān (Jsh).

P. 644, l. 13. R supplies a *post. n.* in imitation (see p. 647, l. 21).

P. 645, l. 21. By Ghassān Ibn ‘Ula (MN, FA, J, Jsh) Ibn Murra (MN, Jsh) Ibn ‘Ubād (MN). Murra Ibn ‘Ubād was of Kaṣ Ibn Tha‘laba (IKb). [There was a poet named] Ghassān Ibn Wa‘la, one of the Banū Murra Ibn ‘Ubād (T). [The name of] the author of this ‘verse has not reached me: Iamb says “AASH transmits it with Ḍamm of <sup>أهـ</sup>م<sup>هـ</sup> !” “on the authority of Ghassān, who is one of those on whose authority “the classical language is derived from the Arabs”; so that Ghassān is the author of the verse: but IHsh asserts that it is by a man of Ghassān; and God knows best! (AKB).

P. 646, l. 3. Hārūn Ibn Musā [alAzdi al‘Atakī, their freedman (IHjr), a Jew, who afterwards become a Muslim (IKb, NA),] alA‘war [the one-eyed], the [Baṣrī Grammarian and (NA, IHjr)] Reader (IKb, NA, IHjr). He transmitted readings from IIU (IKhn). The Follower (Nw, ITB) Ṭalḥa Ibn Muṣarrif [alYāmi (Nw, IHjr), or alYāmi (Nw), alHamdāni (Nw, ITB)], the Kūfī Reader, *d.* [110 (Nw),] 112 (IKb, Nw, IHjr, ITB), or 113 (Nw). Yām or Iyām is a clan of Hamdān (LL)—l. 4. After “alHarrā” insert “the master of Fr.” This is MIM.

P. 651, l. 1. This is one of the 50 verses of S whose authors are not known: but is asserted by Al‘Ainī, who is followed by Syt in the SM, to be part of an ode by AlMuthakḳīb al‘Abdī; whereas there is no foundation for this (AKB). It is by Suḥaim Ibn WathīlarRiyāḥī (MN, FA, N), from the same ode as <sup>أنا ابن جلا أله</sup> [149] (N)—l. 2. An ancient heathen poet, contemporary with ‘Amr Ibn Hind; so says IKb

(AKB). His name, [as IKb says, was Miḥsan Ibn Thaʿlaba; but, as IAMB says (AKB),] was ʿĀʾidh Ibn Miḥsan (ID, MN, Nw, AKB) Ibn Thaʿlaba (MN, AKB).

P. 652, l. 10. The *ps.* are superfluous to the attribution—l. 19. The ʿ*Aḳīk* [*pl. Aʿīkka* (KF)] is every channel [of water (MI)] that [the water of (KF)] the torrent has cloven (MI, KF) in the earth, and then enlarged and widened. The lands of the Arabs contain many *Aʿīkka*; and the mention of the ʿ*Aḳīk* in poetry is frequent (MI).

P. 653, l. 3. By Laḳīṭ Ibn Zurāra (AKB), *k.* on the day of Jabala (SR, ID).

P. 654, l. l. See p. 659, l. 15.

P. 655, ll. 4-6. This is the opinion of IH (*p.* 652, ll. 2-3) and R (ll. 8-9 below).

P. 656, l. 13. Read "197".

P. 657, l. 10. <sup>فَطَحَلْ</sup> (Th, IY, KF, MAd) or <sup>فَطَحَلْ</sup> (Th, KF) or <sup>فَطَحَلْ</sup> (MAd).

P. 660, ll. 3-4. This is one of 7 verses by ʿAntara, the author of the Muʿallaḳa [see Ahl. 35]; and is also transmitted as by Khuzaz Ibn Laudhān asSadūsī. Both of them were heathens. ʿAntara addressed those verses to his wife, who ceased not to mention his horses, and to reproach him about a steed which he used to prefer above the rest of his horses, and to which he used to give milk to drink (AKB)—l. 5.

<sup>العَتِيقِ</sup> is a name for *dates*, a proper name (AKB). For "*wine*" read "*dates*".

P. 661, l. 3. <sup>أَرْصَتْ</sup> (R): <sup>وَصَتْ</sup> (K. 1071). <sup>الْقَرَأَطِقْ</sup> *pl.* of <sup>الْقَرَطِقْ</sup> (N), which is Persian (Jk), arabicized (Jk, KF) from <sup>كَرْطَه</sup> (KF): <sup>الْقَرَأَطِفْ</sup> (K, R), *pl.* of <sup>قَرَطَفْ</sup>, like <sup>جَعْفَر</sup>, which is a <sup>قُطَيْفَة</sup>, i. e. *garment having a nap*. This verse is from an ode by Muʿakkir Ibn Aus alʿAzdī alBāriḳī, [a heathen poet (ID),] praising the Banū Numair, and

mentioning what they did to the Banū Dhubyān at the Pass of Jabala, where a battle took place between the Banū Dhubyān and the Banū 'Āmir, in which the Banū 'Āmir were victorious. Numair was the progenitor of a tribe of Kais, vid. Numair Ibn 'Āmir Ibn Ṣaṣ'a'a; and Mu'aḳḳir was a confederate of theirs. The day of Jabala was 59 years before Islām, and 19 years before the birth of the Prophet, [who began his Mission at the age of 40 (SR, Tr, LM)]: so in the KA by AFI (AKB). Jabala was a [huge (Bk)] red mountain in Najd (Bk, MI) —ll. 4-5. He says *Many a Dhubyānī woman was there that bade her sons take plenty of these two things as booty*, if they should overcome their enemies; and that because of their neediness, and the fewness of their goods (AKB). MDE, who says that she *enjoined her sons to take care of the coats, etc.*, seems to have misunderstood the verse, probably from not knowing the occasion; but this is strange, because the K has "as though he said, *that bade them take them as booty*".

P. 662, l. 5. The word "mostly" is a reservation of such as كَذَبَ.

P. 665, ll. 22—23. Umm Sālim was his beloved (AKB).

P. 668, l. l. *Dele* the full stop after "Th".

P. 670, l. 10. Lane (p. 1350, col. 1), citing the KF as his authority, says "The word سُرْعَانٌ is used as a simple enunciative [placed before "its inchoative], and also as an enunciative denoting wonder": but this rendering of the KF involves serious errors, because (1) it gives سُرْعَانٌ a place in inflection, vid. that of a *nom.* as an *enunc.*, whereas the majority of GG hold that the verbal *n.* has no place in inflection; while those who give it the place of a *nom.* make it an *inch.*, not an *enunc.* (p. 658 above): (2) if it were an *enunc.*, it would not be placed before its *inch.*, because, since, like other verbal *ns.*, it governs an *ag.* (p. 661), the *post-pos. inch.* would be taken for an *ag.*; so that سُرْعَانٌ ذَا, like سُرْعَانٌ زَيْدٌ, would not be allowable as *enunc.* and *inch.* (p. 111). The words of the KF are سُرْعَانٌ يَسْتَعْمَلُ خَبْرًا مَحْضًا وَخَبْرًا فِيهِ

سُرْعَانِ مَعْنَى التَّعَجُّبِ And سُرْعَانِ is used as a simple enunciation, [i. e. *Quick is*]; and as an enunciation containing the sense of wonder, [i. e. *How quick is!*]: خُذْ meaning enunciation, the correl. of command; not enunc., the correl. of *inch.*

P. 672, l. 19. I. e. AlFaḍl Ibn Ḳudāma (ID, K<sub>A</sub>, SM, AKB), who contended with Al'Ajjāj in reciting poetry of the Rajaz metre, and was contemporary with [the Khalifa (Nw, ITB)] Hishām Ibn 'Abd AlMalik (AKB) alḲurashī alUmawī adDimashqī (ITB), b. 72 (Nw), a. 105, d. 125 (Nw, ITB).

P. 673, l. 2. By Zaid Ibn 'Amr Ibn Nufail alḲurashī al'Adawī, d. 5 years before the Mission: but attributed to his son Sa'īd Ibn Zaid [aṣṢahābī (Nw)], d. 50 or 51 or 52, at the age of 70 and odd, or of 73, years; and to Nubaih Ibn AlḤajjāj. Nubaih and his brother Munabbih were chiefs [of the Banū Sahm (ID)] of Ḳuraish; and were killed, [with Al'Āṣ son of Munabbih (SR),] on the day of Badr as unbelievers (AKB) —l. 20. The Khalifa Sulaimān Ibn 'Abd AlMalik [alUmawī (ITB), b. 60 (FW, TKh)], a. 96, d. 99 (MDh, FW, ITB, TKh) at the age of [39 (MDh),] 45 (MDh, ITB), or 53 (MDh).

P. 674, ll. 6-7. The verbal and *inf. ns.* may both be said to act as substitutes for the *v.*; but with the latter the *v.* is, and with the former it is not, supplied—l. 11. Of Khunā'a Ibn Sa'īd Ibn Hudhail (DH)—l. 15. 'Alī Ibn Mas'ūd alAzdī [alGhassānī (Tr, IATH)] was brother of 'Abd Manāt Ibn Kināna on the side of his mother [Fukaiha Bint Hanī (Tr, IATH)]; and, when 'Abd Manāt died, he brought up 'Abd Manāt's children, whose origin was therefore traced to him (DH), so that the Banū 'Abd Manāt were called Banū 'Alī (Tr, IATH).

P. 675, l. 3. سِرٌّ Journey thou (R)—l. 5. سِرٌّ Journey ys (R)—ll.

17-19. It is sometimes *pre.* to the *ag.*, as رَوَيْدَكَ زَيْدًا [161, 187, 560].

P. 676, l. 6. يَغِبُّ (T): يَغِبُّ (Md). يَغِبُّ is in the *ind.*, the *prop.*, being supposed to be anacoluthic and in ceptvei [423], ananswer to

an assumed question "Why should I leave it alone?" [1]; and <sup>يُغِبُّ</sup> is in the *apoc.*, as *correl.* of the command, there being no ف [421]. Lane (p. 2221, col. 2) apparently considers <sup>يُغِبُّ</sup> to be in the *subj.*: for he says "<sup>حَتَّى</sup> being understood, according to the explanation of Meyd", i. e. Md; while the *apoc.* does not occur after <sup>حَتَّى</sup> [414]. But Md's words <sup>لِي دَعَهُ حَتَّى تَأْتِيَ عَلَيْهِ أَيَّامٌ قَتَنُظَرُ كَيْفَ خَاتَمَتَهُ أَيْحَمَدُ أَمْ يَذِمُّ</sup> i. e. *Leave it alone until etc.* (see the next Note) are an explanation of the sense, not of the syntax; for the *subj.* is not governed by <sup>حَتَّى</sup> [410], but by <sup>أَنْ</sup> necessarily understood after it [411, 413, 501]; while the *subj.* governed by <sup>أَنْ</sup> understood after <sup>حَتَّى</sup> understood is a thing unheard of. Moreover, even with the ف, the *subj.* does not occur in the *correl.* of the requisitive verbal *n.* [187, 411, 421]: and, without the ف, the *subj.* is impossible after a requisitive *v.* [420], such instances as <sup>وَمَرَّ</sup> being anomalous, not to be taken as precedents [418. A]; and much more then after a requisitive verbal *n.*—l. 7. <sup>غَبَّ عِنْدَنَا</sup> *He remained a night with us*, i. q. <sup>بَاتَ</sup>, like <sup>أَغَبَّ</sup>; and hence their saying <sup>رَوَيْدُ الشَّعْرِ يُغِبُّ</sup> (KF), i. e. *Leave it alone until some days pass over it, so that thou mayst see how its end will be, whether it will be praised or blamed*: or it may mean *Leave the poetry alone: it will keep back from the people*, from <sup>غَبَّتِ الْكُمَى</sup> *The fever intermitted, when it keeps back for a day*, i. e. *Repeat not thy poetry to them incessantly, so that they weary of it* (Md). See Md. I. 253 and P. I. 522.

P. 677, l. 5. <sup>يُسْمَعُ</sup> (IY. 507): <sup>يُسْمَعُ</sup> (IY. 511).

P. 680, l. 11. <sup>هَابٌ</sup> (DA. 117, D. 140).

P. 683, l. 4. Muzāḥim Ibn AlḤārith, or, as the author of the KA considers more correct, Ibn 'Amr Ibn Murra Ibn AlḤārith, al'Uḡailī, of the Banū 'Uḡail Ibn Ka'b Ibn Rabī'a Ibn 'Āmir Ibn Ṣa'ṣa'a, an ele-



gant Islāmi poet of the desert, contemporary with Jarīr and AlFarazdaq̣ (AKB)—*l.* 10. Ḥarmala Ibn AlMundhir, or, as is said (KA, Is), AlMundhir Ibn Ḥarmala, [the former being correct (KA),] atṬā'i, a Christian poet [in the beginning of AlIslām (AKB)], who is said to have lived 150 years (KA, Is, AKB), and remained till the days of Mu'āwiyā (Is, AKB).

*P.* 684, *l.* 3. He was one of the one-eyed men of Kais, who were 5 poets, Tamīm Ibn Ubayy Ibn Muḳbil, ArRā'i, AshShammākh, Ibn Aḥmar, and Ḥumaid Ibn Thaur. ISh says that he was one of the poets of heathenism, and reached AlIslām: and IHjr says in the Is (AKB), AlMarzubānī says that he was a Convert, and died in the time of 'Uthmān after having attained a great age; but AFI says that he was one of the renowned poets of heathenism, and afterwards became a Muslim, and praised the Khalīfas that he met, vid. 'Umar and his successors down to 'Abd AlMalik Ibn Marwān, which is contrary to the saying of AlMarzubānī, that he died in the time of 'Uthman (Is, AKB): and God knows! (Is)—*l.* 16-18. What shows it to be a verbal *n.* is the saying of Ibn Harma

يَمْشِي الْغَطُوفُ إِذَا غَنَى الْخَدَاةُ بِهِ \* مَشَى الْجَوَادُ قَبْلَهُ لِجَلَّةِ النَجْبَةِ

[*The slow (beast) steps out, when the drivers sing to him, with the step of the fleet (courser): let alone the full-grown, high-bred (camels)!*, for they, with singing, go faster than others (AKB)], because here it puts what follows it into the *acc.*: whereas in the saying of the other, [Abū Zubaid atṬā'i anNaṣrānī (AKB),]

مَنْ مَبْلَغُ قَوْمِنَا لَتَاثِنِينَ إِذْ شَحَطُوا \* أَنْ أَلْفَاكَ إِلَيْهِمْ شَيْقُ وَاعٍ  
حَمَلْ أَثْقَالِ أَهْلِ الْبُؤْسِ أَوْفَةً \* أَعْطَيْهِمُ الْجَهْدَ مِنْ بِلَهٍ مَا أَسْعَ

[*Who will convey to our distant people, since they have gone far away, that the heart is yearning for them, eagerly longing? (It is) the carrier of the loads of the people of the, i. e., my, love at (many) times. I give them*

the utmost effort of me: let alone what I can easily compass!, the rel. being suppressed, i.e. <sup>سوس</sup>أَسْعَى (AKB)|, مَا may be in the position of an acc., بَلَّهَ containing a pron. in the nom., [i.e. <sup>سوس</sup>فَدَعَ <sup>سوس</sup>الْوَسْعَ (AKB)], as is shown by <sup>سوس</sup>بَلَّهَ <sup>سوس</sup>أَلْتَجِبَا <sup>سوس</sup>الْتَجِبَا [above]; or in the position of a gen., according to him that recites <sup>سوس</sup>بَلَّهَ <sup>سوس</sup>أَلَا كَفَّ [below], making <sup>سوس</sup>بَلَّهَ an *inf. n.* (IY), i. e. <sup>سوس</sup>تَرَكْ <sup>سوس</sup>زَيْدَ [or <sup>سوس</sup>فَتَرَكْ <sup>سوس</sup>الْوَسْعَ, like <sup>سوس</sup>زَيْدَ]; or [in the position of a nom. as an *inch.*, <sup>سوس</sup>بَلَّهَ being i.q. <sup>سوس</sup>كَيْفَ, because] the sense may be <sup>سوس</sup>كَيْفَ <sup>سوس</sup>الْوَسْعَ (Then) how is what I can easily compass, (that I give it not)? (AKB)—ll. 18—21. F says, What confirms its being an *inf. n.* is that AASh transmits مَا بَلَّهَكَ لَا تَفْعَلْ كَذَا What is the matter with thee that thou dost not such a thing?, i.e. مَا كَكَ What ails thee? (AKB). Lane (p. 254, col. 2) has مَا بَلَّهَكَ; and so apparently has the KF (p. 910), though here the vowel-mark is blurred; and the AKB does not give the vowel: but, since <sup>سوس</sup>بَلَّهَ is *infl.* when an *inf. n.*, Damm seems necessary.

P. 685, l. 8. In the year 5 (SR, Tr, LM)—l. 9. See the ode in SR. 705-706—l. 17 and l. 21. Jahn (IY. 513) prints <sup>سوس</sup>مِنْ بَلَّهَ and <sup>سوس</sup>مِنْ بَلَّهَ; but, <sup>سوس</sup>بَلَّهَ being *uninfl.* when i.q. <sup>سوس</sup>كَيْفَ, Fatha, as in <sup>سوس</sup>مِنْ أَيْنَ, seems correct; and is said to be so in the tradition (p. 686, ll. 12-14). See, however, the Note on p. 686, ll. 14-15—l. 22. The SB. III. 309, followed by the K and B, gives this tradition in the exposition of the text <sup>سوس</sup>فَلَا تَعْلَمُ نَفْسٌ مَّا أَخْفَى لَهُمْ مِنْ فِرَّةٍ أَعْيُنٍ XXXII. 17. Then not a soul shall know what delight of eyes hath been hidden for them, not of the <sup>سوس</sup>أَلَمْ; so that Lane is wrong in inserting "[by those three letters]" after "God says" (p. 686, l. 1).

P. 686, l. 3. <sup>سوس</sup>بَلَّهَ [without <sup>سوس</sup>مِنْ] (SB, K, B); [and so in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Muslim:] but <sup>سوس</sup>مِنْ <sup>سوس</sup>بَلَّهَ occurs in most of the MSS of the SB; and IHjr



camels. He came up with them, saying قَرَاكَهَا آلَخ, or, in another version, دَرَاكَهَا مِنْ إِبِلٍ دَرَاكَهَا آلَخ *Overtake them, etc.*; and, bearing down upon the stallion of the camels, hamstrung him, whereupon the camels circled round him: then the Banu-l-Hārith Ibn Ka'b, coming up with Tufail, rescued his herd, while Kinda were put to flight (AKB). الْخَيْلُ (IY): الْمَوْتُ *death* (Mb. 269, AKB. II. 354). The fighting occurs at the hinder parts of the camels, because the raiders drive them, and urge them on; while the owners hinder them from that (AKB).

P. 688, l. 3. By Abu-n-Najm al-Tjli, an Islāmī Rājiz (AKB).

P. 689, l. 15. R has followed the author of the Ṣiḥāḥ in his relating the verse thus. It is compounded of 2 verses: for the verse containing دُعَيْتُ نَزَالٍ, which is by Zuhair Ibn Abī Sulmā, has for its 1st hemistich

وَلَنْعَمَ حَشْوُ الدِّرْعِ أَنْتَ إِذَا

*And assuredly most excellent is the padding, i.e. wearer, of the coat of mail, thou, when;* while لَأَنْتَ أَشْجَعُ آلَخ is the 1st hemistich of a verse by AlMusayyab Ibn 'Alas, the 2nd hemistich of which is

يَقْعُ الصَّرَاخُ وَلَيَجُ فِي الدَّعْرِ

*the cry for help occurs, and etc.* The latter verse, which is from an ode praising Kais Ibn Ma'dikarib al-Kindī, who died in heathenism, whence نَصَفَ الْكِنَّهَارُ آلَخ [80], is attributed by As to AlMusayyab Ibn 'Alas al-Jumā'i, who was maternal uncle of AlA'shā Maimūn, and was a heathen poet, who did not reach AlIslām; but by AU, ID, and others to his sister's son AlA'shā Maimūn (AKB).

P. 690, l. 20. An admirable minor heathen poet (AKB).

P. 691, ll. 6-7. AtTaimī, a heathen poet, retorting upon Laḳīṭ Ibn Zurāra atTamīmī, who had satirized 'Adī and Taim. He upbraids

Lakīṭ with having fled in a battle where his brother Ma'bad Ibn Zurāra had been taken prisoner; and attributes his flight to greediness for food and drink (AKB)—l. 15. See the ode in SR. 723—l. 16. In the year 6 (LM)—ll. 19-20. Because the form of the *inf. n.* is not that of the *d.s.*, which is really an *ep.* [76] (IY. 241).

P. 692, ll. 20-21. See Md. II. 164 and P. II. 547, III. 285.

P. 693, ll. 5-10. See the Note on p. 38, ll. 3-4; and see p. 698, ll. 10-18—l. 21. Read “أَطَوَّفَ آلَهِ” [497].

P. 694, l. 15. Mb does not say “used in the *non-voc.*”; but implies these words by the form of his *exs.*, حَلَّاقِي يَا فُتَّى and جَعَارِي يَا فُتَّى, the *voc.* phrase يَا فُتَّى being added to show that جَعَارِي and حَلَّاقِي are not *vocs.* themselves.

P. 695, l. 16. Ibn Ja'far Ibn Kilāb (SR). He was a heathen (IAth. I. 416).

P. 696, l. 15. The reference is to p. 691, l. 5—l. 16. R cites this hemistich to show that بَدَّكَ is a *fem. ep.* made to deviate from مَتَّبِدَّةٌ, i.e. مَتَّفِرَّةٌ; but this is contrary to the saying of S, who cites it to show that بَدَّكَ is made to deviate from a *fem. inf. n.*, not from an *ep.*; and بَدَّكَ occurs also as an *imp. verbal n.*: so that, according to this, بَدَّكَ is of 3 kinds (AKB): but R's explanation obviously fails when بَدَّكَ occurs as a *d.s.* to a *masc.*, as in the verse of Ḥassān at p. 691; whereas S's explanation, which is adopted by IY, applies in the case of both genders.

P. 697, l. 1. Sajāḥ Bint AlḤārith [Ibn Suwaid (MDh, IAth)] at Tamīmīya, [of the Banū Yarbū' (IKb),] who set up as a Prophetess in the Apostacy, and was followed by some people [of the Banū Tamīm (IKb)]. She afterwards made peace with Musailima, and married him; but, after his death, she returned to Al-Islām. She lived till the Khilāfa of Mu'āwīya (Is)—l. 2. Musailima [Ibn Ḥabīb (SR, IKb) alḤanaftī (SR) of the Banū 'Adī Ibn Ḥanīfa Ibn Lujaim (IKb)], the Impostor of

AlYamāma, *k.* 11 (MDh)—*ll.* 5-6. See Md. I. 161, P. I. 32g—*l.* 17 King of AlHira, commonly called AlMundhir Ibn Má asSamá after his mother Māwiya Bint 'Auf Ibn Jusham, who received the cognomen of Má asSamá [*Water of Heaven*] on account of her beauty (AF)—*l.* 14. See Md. I. 79, P. I. 151—*ll.* 16-17. Sgh says, Laṣāf is the name of a water in a place between Makka and AlBaṣra belonging to the Banū Yarbū' of the tribe of Tamim : Bk says (AKB), Laṣāf, says Ath, is a water belonging to the Banū Yarbū' (Bk, AKB).

P. 698, *l.* 3. By Abū Muhawwish Rabī'a, or Ḥaut, Ibn Ri'āb alĀsadi [alFak'asī (Mb)], mentioned by IHjr in the Is among the Converts who reached the Prophet, but did not see him. The poet is satirizing Nahshal Ibn Ḥarrī (AKB)—*l.* 7. The version فَيْه, [which occurs in the ID. 137,] is transmitted by Jhand Sgh; and the version فَيْه by many, among them ISk, K1, AAMr, and Bk (AKB)—*l.* 15. The reference is to *p.* 693, *ll.* 5-10. See the Note on *p.* 38, *ll.* 3 4—*l.* 18. "like قَاسٍ," means "governed by the rules laid down in *p.* 699, *l.* 20—*p.* 701, *l.* 3."

P. 700, *l.* 1. The father of Ḥanīfa and 'Ijl (MN). See Md. I. 160. But see too *p.* 27A, *l.* 18—*l.* 22. One of the champion poets of heathenism, who was named صَاحِبُ الصَّانِجَةِ الْعَرَبِ The Cymbalist, or Harper, of the Arabs on account of the excellence of his poetry. He reached AlIslām at the end of his life; and set out, during the peace of AlHudaibiya, [concluded between the Prophet and Kuraish in the year 6, and broken in the year 8 (SR, LM),] on a journey to the Prophet, in whose praise he composed an ode beginning أَلَمْ تُغْتَمِضْ لَئِنْ [126]: but he was dissuaded by Abū Sufyān at Makka from carrying out his intention; and went away to AlYamāma, where he was thrown by a camel and killed. The ode is an excellent one, numbering 24 verses, most of which are cited by the ML, while not one of them occurs among these Evidentiary Verses. [It is given at length in *pp.* 255-256 of the SR.] ALA'shā in lexicology is *he that sees not by night, but sees by day* [i.e. *blind by night*];

and this A'shā became [altogether] blind towards the end of his life. The number of poets who were *blind by night* is 17 (AKB).

P. 701, l. 1. Iram is the name of a tribe; and 'Ād too is a tribe, vid. the people of [the Prophet (IBd)] Hūd (peace be upon him !) (AAz). He was Hūd Ibn 'Abd Allāh.....Ibn 'Ād Ibn 'Auṣ Ibn Iram Ibn Sām Ibn Nūḥ (IKb, Tr, IBd, B on VII. 63); or, as is said (Tr, B) by some genealogists (Tr), Hūd was ['Ābar (Tr)] Ibn Shālakh Ibn Arfakhshad Ibn Sām (Tr, K on VII. 63, B) Ibn Nūḥ (Tr, K), [grand] son of the uncle of the father of 'Ād (B). These two tribes, 'Ād Ibn 'Auṣ Ibn Iram and Thamūd Ibn Jāthar Ibn Iram, were descended from Iram; and they were the indigenous Arabs (Tr). Historians, however, divide the Arabs into 3 kinds, (1) extinct, i. e. the first Arabs, the details of whose histories have gone from us on account of the antiquity of their epoch, vid. 'Ād, Thamūd, Jadīs, Ṭasm, and the 1st Jurhum, who were in the time of 'Ād; whereas the 2nd Jurhum were among the children of Qaḥṭān: (a) Noah carried [in the Ark] those that God had commanded him to carry: and among them were the 3 sons of Noah, vid. Shem, Ham and Japheth, and their wives; and some say that he carried 6 [other] persons also, and some say 80 men [and women (Nw)], one of whom was [the 1st] Jurhum, all of the children of Seth (MAB): (b) 'Ād son of 'Auṣ Ibn Iram (SR), Thamūd and Jadīs, sons of [Jāthar or] 'Āthar Ibn Iram, and Ṭasm, ['Imlik or (KF)] 'Imlik, and Umaim, sons of Lāwadh Ibn Sām Ibn Nūḥ, were all of them Arabs (SR, TKh): so in the SR (TKh): (2) indigenous, i. e., the Arabs of AlYaman, vid. the Banū Qaḥṭān Ibn 'Ābar Ibn [Shālakh or] Shālakh Ibn Arfakhshad Ibn Sām Ibn Nūḥ, whence the Banū Jurhum Ibn Qaḥṭān and the Banū Saba Ibn Yashjub Ibn Ya'rūb Ibn Qaḥṭān: (3) insititious, i. e., the children of Ismā'il Ibn Ibrāhīm, who, when Abraham had settled him at Makka, joined the 2nd Jurhum, who were residing in the neighbourhood of Makka, and took a wife from them, [vid. Ra'la (SR KA. XIII. 108, TKh) asSayyida (Tr), daughter of Muḍāḍ Ibn 'Amr alJurhumī (SR, Tr, KA, TKh)]; so that he and his children are called insititious Arabs, because Ishmael's origin and language were Hebrew

(MAB), and he [and his children (Iath)] learnt Arabic from Jurhum (Iath, IKhd, TKh) : (a) Ka'idhar Ibn Ismā'il was the father of the [in-sititious] Arabs (KF); and the tribes of the children of Ishmael branched out from 'Adu'n (SR, TKh), who, according to the pedigree preferred, was 'Adu'n Ibn Udd Ibn Udad.....Ibn Ka'idhar Ibn Ismā'il (MAB).

أَازَر [the name of Abraham's father (K)] is most probably [a foreign proper name (B)] upon [the measure of (K)] فَاعَلٌ, like [تَارَحٌ (K),] عَابَرٌ (K, B on VI. 74), عَازَرٌ, شَالَحٌ (K) [or] شَالَحٌ (B), فَالَحٌ, and similar names of theirs (K)—l. 2. Khl says (Bk), Wabār was a country [193] belonging to 'Ad (Bk, AAz), between AlYaman and the sands of Yabrin (Bk) : so in the Ṣihāḥ. but some say that Wabār [Ibn Umaim (Tr, MDh)] is the name [of the progenitor] of an ancient people of the indigenous Arabs, that perished like 'Ad and Thamūd (AAz)—l. 13. 'Umaid Ibn Kays [alAsadi, their freedman (Nw),] alMakkī alA'raj (Nw, IHjr), the Reader, *d.* in or after 130 (IHjr). The A'raj celebrated for reporting Abū Huraira is 'Abd ArRaḥman Ibn Hurmuz alA'raj, a Madani Follower, a Kuraishi, freedman of Rabi'a Ibn AlḤārith Ibn 'Abd AlMuṭṭalib or of 'Umar Ibn Abi Rabi'a, *d.* 117, or, as is said, 110, the former being the true [date] (Nw)—l. 16. The Mu'adhdhin Abū Ḥaiwa Shuraiḥ Ibn Yazīd alḤadramī alḤimṣī, *d.* 203 (IHjr)—l. 17. Ka'nab atTamūni alKūfi, of the 6th class of Traditionists, *vid.* those who were contemporary with the 5th, but are not authentically recorded as having met any of the Companions, like [the Follower of the Followers (Nw)] 'Abd AlMalik Ibn 'Abd Al'Azīz Ibn Juraij [alKuraishi (Nw)] alUmawī, their freedman, alMakkī, the Jurist, *d.* [149 (Nw),] 150, [151, or 160 (Nw),] being then past 70, or, as is said, past 100, which is not authentic (IHjr).

P. 703, 22. In some MSS <sup>أَازَر</sup> *day* is found instead of <sup>أَازَر</sup> in both places (MAd). So too in the M, IY, AAz, and AKB. III. 56. The Sb, Mr. I. 152, YS. II. 205, MAd, and MKh. II. 105 have <sup>أَازَر</sup>.



P. 704, l. 1. AlA'shà Maimān (AKB)—l. 2. ISB says that Hayyān and Jābir were sons of 'Amīra of the Banū Hānifa, and that Hayyān was a boon companion of AlA'shà (AKB)—l. 7. A freedman of [the Banū (IKhu)] Sulaim (IKhu, AKB), as is said (IKhu); or, as is said, one of the Banū Jadhīma Ibn Mālik Ibn Naṣr Ibn Ku'ain (AKB), of the Banū Asad Ibn Khuzaima (IKb, ID): and God knows! (IKhu). He was a born poet. The cause of the ode was that Rabi'a had praised Yazīd Ibn Usaid, who was then Governor of Armenia, in an excellent poem; but Yazīd failed to reward him properly: whereas, when he praised Yazīd Ibn Ḥātim, the latter was extremely liberal to him (AKB).

P. 708, l. 1. Praising AnNu'mān Ibn AlMundhir (AKB)—ll. 3-4 AḌ transmits the saying of the Rājiz

وَيْهَا فِدَاؤُكَ يَا فَضَالَةَ • أَجْرُهُ الرَّمْحُ وَلَا تَهَالَةَ

(IY, AKB) *Go on, let the people, or mankind, ransom thee, O Faḍāla! Make him trail the spear, and be not dismayed*, where فِدَاؤُكَ has literally no *ag.*,

but the *ag.* is understood from the context, i.e. لِيَقْدِكَ النَّاسُ and the like (AKB)—ll. 17-19. فِدَاؤُكَ is a verbal *n.* transferred from the *inf. n.* [187]. F says "It is *uninfl.* because it implies the sense of the *p.*, vid.

"the *imp.* ى, since فِدَاؤُكَ is constructively لِيَقْدِكَ; it is *uninfl.* "upon Kasr, because it denotes the *imp.*, and the *imp.*, when vocalized, "is vocalized with Kasr [664]; and they pronounce it with Tanwīn, "because it is *indet.*" (AKB).

P. 709, l. 20. See SB. I. 475.

P. 710, l. 22. مَكَانُكَ means اَلْزَمْ مَكَانَكَ keep thy place (R); [and so] مَكَانُكُمْ X. 29. means اَلْزَمُوا مَكَانَكُمْ keep your places (K, B): but these are explanations of the sense, not of the construction, otherwise the *pre.n.* in مَكَانُكَ and مَكَانُكُمْ would be a direct *obj.*, an *notādū*.

P. 712, l. 16 and l. 17. "what" means "the state of the *pron.* a, *ag.*, *obj.*, or *gen.*"

P. 714, l. 24. I do not know who Jahm was; and God knows! (AKB).

P. 715, ll. 5-6. The [whole] verse occurs in the poems of 2 poets, (1) 'Uwāif alKawāfi, i. e. 'Uwāif Ibn Mu'āwiya [alFazārī (KA)], a minor poet of the Umawī dynasty : (2) Suḥaim, or, as some name him, Ḥayya, the black Abyssinian slave of the Banu-lḤaṣḥās, who, says Ibn Hishām in the SR, were of Asad Ibn Khuzaima, a [celebrated (Is)] converted poet, who reached heathenism and AlIslām, and was killed in the Khilāfa of 'Uthmān; but in his poem the version is <sup>أَوْدَةٌ رَدْفِي</sup>; *And he that rode behind me cried (to the camels).* And the 1st hemistich occurs in the beginning of a verse in an ode by Muḍarris Ibn Rib'ī.....Ibn Fak'as.....Ibn Asad Ibn Khuzaima, a good heathen poet, describing *camels*; and is followed by

وَقُلْنَ لِحَادِيهِنَّ هَلْ أَنتَ نَاطِرٌ

*And said to their driver, Art thou waiting for him?* (AKB)—l. 9. This is the meaning generally assigned: but some say that he means by the <sup>رَدْف</sup> his follower of the Jinn; for, when the rhymes crowded together in his mind, and whispered to him, men used to say he had a devil that whispered to him; and, in this case, the *pron.* in <sup>دُعَاهُنَّ</sup> belongs to the rhymes, i. e. *My devil called the rhymes, and they answered him, and poured out upon him,* meaning that *Poetry obeyed him* (AKB).

P. 722, l. 17. I am not acquainted with the name of the author of this verse (MN). Fr says, It was recited to me by one of the Banū 'Ukail (AKB)—l. 18. Al'Azd, or Al'Asd, was the father of a tribe of AlYaman, vid. Al'Azd Ibn AlGhauth Ibn Nabt Ibn Mālik [Ibn Zaid (IKb, Kab, Dh)] Ibn Kaṭṭān Ibn Saba, one of whose branches was called <sup>أَزْدُ شَنْوَةَ</sup> *Azd Shanū'a*, from <sup>شَنْوَةَ</sup> meaning *keeping aloof from*

pollutions ; and sometimes, says ISk, <sup>أَزْدَ شَنْوَةَ</sup> *ʾAzd Shanūwa* (AKB)—7.  
 20. This is the last of 5 verses by Yazid Ibn ‘Amr Ibn Khuwailid aṣṢa‘īk alKilābī ; but Al‘Ainī says its author is ‘Abd Allāh Ibn Ya‘rub Ibn Mu‘āwiya Ibn ‘Uḥāda Ibn AlBakkā [Rabi‘a (IKhn)] Ibn ‘Amir [Ibn Rabi‘a Ibn ‘Āmir Ibn Ṣa‘ṣa‘a (IKb, IKhn)]. It is generally related, [as by Al‘Ainī in the MN and FA,] with <sup>بِالْمَاءِ الْحَمِيمِ</sup> *with hot*, [or as some say, *cold* (MN, FA),] *water* ; but Thi and Z relate it with <sup>بِالْمَاءِ الْغَرَاتِ</sup>, which perhaps is from another poem (AKB).

P. 723, l. 6. According to R, <sup>قَبْلَ</sup> and <sup>قَبْلُ</sup> mean the same, o.g. <sup>قَبْلُ</sup> *before (that)*, both being intended to be understood as *pre.* : but <sup>قَبْلُ</sup> is *uninf.* because the *post.* is suppressed ; while <sup>قَبْلًا</sup> is *inf.* because the *post.* is, as it were, expressed by means of the compensatory Tanwīn.

P. 724, l. 15. Part of a poem recited by Ma‘n Ibn Aus alMuzanī in the presence of Mu‘āwiya and ‘Abd Allāh Ibn AzZubair (Mḡ. 357).

P. 725, l. 1. There is another version <sup>تَعَالَى بَنُ مَزَاحِمٍ</sup> *Ta‘illa Ibn Muzāḥim* (MN)—ll. 4-5. Read “with <sup>مِنْ قَدَامٍ</sup>, [for <sup>مِنْ قَدَامٍ</sup>,] making it *indet.*, like <sup>مِنْ قَبْلٍ</sup> [above], <sup>مِنْ عَلٍ</sup> [below], and the like ; but” —l. 14. “[the sign of] the *nom.* and *acc.*” here (R. II. 81, l. 5) is a loose expression for “Ḍamm or the sign of the *acc.*”

P. 726, l. 15. And also, if it were *pre.*, <sup>مِنْ عَلَيَّ</sup> meaning *from above me* would be said, because the sense requires that, not <sup>مِنْ عَلَيَّ</sup> (DM).

P. 728, l. 6. IBr says that this Rajaz is by Ghailān Ibn Huraith aṣṢa‘īk ; but I have not met with any information about Ghailān (AKB)—l. 7. The A‘shā of Bāhila was ‘Āmir Ibn AlHārith, a celebrated heathen poet, author of an elegy on his half-brother by his mother’s

side, AlMuntashir Ibn Wahb, as AU says, or Ibn Hubaira Ibn Wahb, as As says (AKB).

P. 732, l. 7. On the clause "the saying <sup>سَأَلَ</sup> <sup>لَهُ</sup> being a solecism" (p. 730, ll. 7-8) the DM has a Note to the same effect as this passage from the Fk; and from this Note the words "liko R" have been abstracted.

P. 733, l. 18. The *dem.* "this", as appears from the Sn, may include the two usages of <sup>حَسَبَ</sup>, as an *indet. ep.* and as a *prim.* substantive.

P. 735, l. 20. See Mb. 698, ll. 2-6.

P. 736, l. 2. The *n.* of *time* is said to be in sense the *adv.* of the *inf. n.* of, i.e. implied by, the *prop.*, because it denotes the *time of the occurrence indicated by the inf. n.*, as LI. 13., where <sup>أُحْرِقَ</sup> denotes the *time of their being burnt*, contrary to IV. 50., where <sup>أُحْرِقَ</sup> does not denote the *time of Our deforming*. It is not in letter the *adv.* of the *inf. n.*, because it is not governed in the *acc.* by that *inf. n.* [64].

P. 738, l. 19. This verse is from an ode by Abū Kais [Ṣaifī (ID)] Ibn 'Āmir alAslat Ibn Jusham .....Ibn AlAus [alAnṣārī (AGh) alAusī (Is)], a heathen poet. The author of the KA says his name has not come to my knowledge; but IHjr in the Is says his name was Ṣaifī or AlḤārith or 'Abd Allāh or Ṣirma or something else; [and the first 3 names are given in the AGh]. He died 10 months after the Hijra: or, [when the Prophet arrived at AlMadīna (Is),] he fled to Makka, and abode with Quraysh until the year of the Conquest, [i.e. the year 8 (SR, LM)]. But Z attributes the verse to AshShammākh; some of the Commentators of S to a man of Kināna; and a learned foreigner to Abū Kais Ibn Rifā'a alAnṣārī. No one, however, called Abū Kais Ibn Rifā'a is to be found in the Books of the Companions: but only 1 or 2 Companions called Kais Ibn Rifā'a, the 1st being Kais Ibn Rifā'a alAnṣārī [alAusī] alWākifī, of the Banū Wākif, [whose name was Malīk (Nw),] Ibn Imra alKais Ibn Malīk Ibn AlAus, mentioned in the MSh; and the 2nd Kais Ibn Rifā'a.....Ibn Numair alAnṣārī,

who was a poet, and, says IIIjr, may perhaps be the same as the preceding (AKB). The name of Abū Kāis Ibn Rifā'a alAnṣārī was Dīnār (Jsh).

P. 739, l. 8. Jj composed a Commentary, which he named the *Mughnā*, on the *Īqāh* of F (HKh)—l. 18. This homistich is from a long ode by AlFarazdaq satirizing Jarir, of which we must mention two verses in order that its meaning may become manifest, vid.

أَنَا لَنَضْرِبُ رَأْسَ كُلِّ قَبِيلَةٍ \* وَأَبُوكَ خَلْفَ أَثَانِهِ يَتَقَمَّلُ  
يَهْزُ أَلْهَرَانِعَ عَقْدَةٍ عِنْدَ الْخَصِيِّ \* يَا ذُلَّ حَيْثُ يَكُونُ مَنْ يَتَذَلُّ

*Verily we smite the head of every tribe; and thy father, behind his she-ass, kills lice. His squeeze with the thumb and forefinger crushes the small lice beside the testicles. O etc!* The عَقْدُ is a mode of counting with the fingers of the two hands; and he means the عَقْدُ الثَّلَاثِينَ counting of thirty, which is effected by placing your thumb at the end of the fore-finger, i.e. by joining their tips, like the holder of a needle (AKB).

P. 743, l. 8. This text is somewhat garbled in the R (vol. II, p. 84, l. 19).

P. 745, ll. 10-11. بِغَيْرِهَا by something else (ML), i.e. بِغَيْرِ مَنْ (DM). Lane (p. 683, col. 2) says "by another prep.", thus making كَيْ in the subsequent ex. a prep.

P. 746, l. 14. Lane (p. 683, col. 3) has "where I saw Zeyd".

P. 747, ll. 6-7. كَذَا represents the 2 regs. of أَنْ, e.g. زَيْدًا قَائِمًا; and أَنْ with its 2 regs. is renderable by a single term, e.g. قِيَامُ زَيْدٍ, post. to حَيْثُ, From the place, i.e. circumstance or fact, that Zaid is standing, i.e. of Zaid's standing, i.e. Whereas Zaid is standing, حَيْثُ place in مَنْ حَيْثُ أَنْ signifying circumstance or fact, like جَا place in the similar Persian expression از آنجا که From that place, i.e., circumstance or

*fact, that, i.e., Whereas*—l. 11. An [excellent (KA, MN) Islāmi (AKB)] poet, contemporary with the Umawī and ‘Abbāsī dynasties (KA, MN, AKB), *d.* in the year 180 odd (AKB).

P. 755, l. l. Insert “but the 2 doctrines [of *redundance* and *verification* (DM)] are of no account, [because they involve the assertion of exclusion of a word from its well known meaning without any evidence (DM)] :” before “while.”

P. 756, ll. 4 5. This is what determines that “the text” [in p. 755, l. l. and p. 756, l. 3] must be taken to refer to XLIII. 38. (DM); and not, as Lane (p. 39. col. 1, ll. 47-52) supposes, to II. 28.

P. 757, l. 12. I have seen in the KA what indicates that this verse is by ‘Abd Allāh Ibn AlMu’tazz; though its last hemistich is cited in the form of

وَصَوَّرَ جَامِعَةُ أَزْمَانٍ أَزْمَانًا

*When the home was uniting us times and times* [211]: but I have seen the verse attributed to one of the Arabs in the *Nawādir* of AZ, who cites it in the same form as IHsh; and AZ died before ‘Abd Allāh Ibn AlMu’tazz was born (SM). See KA. IX. 142.

P. 758, l. 3. See Md. II. 219 and P. II. 677.

P. 759, l. 16. I. e. Having already the sense, <sup>أَلِ</sup> now acquires the government, of <sup>أَنْ</sup> though the affixion of <sup>مَا</sup> (see p. 771, l. l.)—l. 19. The argument is that, the government of the *apoc.* by <sup>أَلِ</sup> not being explicable on the ground of composition, <sup>مَا</sup> must be an <sup>ء</sup> apocopative *p.*—l. l. The author of the 2 verses [cited in § 589] is said [by S and others (AKB)] to be ‘Abd Allāh Ibn Hammām asSalūlī (S, AKB), of the Banū Murra Ibn Ṣa’ṣa’a of Kais ‘Ailān, who are known as the Banū Salūl, their mother being Salūl Bint Dhuhl Ibn Shaibān Ibn Tha’laba, wife of Murra Ibn Ṣa’ṣa’a. This ‘Abd Allāh was an Islāmi poet of the Followers. The poet traces his lineage to Fahm [Ibn ‘Amr Ibn Kais Ibn ‘Ailān (IHb, IKb)] and Ashja’ [Ibn Raith Ibn Ḥaṭaṣān Ibn Sa’d

Ibn Kais (IIb, IKb)], though he was of Salul, because they were all of Kais [Ibn] 'Ailān Ibn Muḍar (AKB).

P. 760, l. 1. *Delete* the semicolon.

P. 761, l. 1. 'The construction of this text mentioned by IIIsh does not occur in the language of Z (DM). [The latter indeed says on X. 22.] It is as though He said <sup>أَإِذَا رَحِمْنَاهُمْ مِنْ بَعْدِ ضَرِّ أَوْ فَاجٍ أَوْ قَتْلٍ أَوْ كَرْ</sup> <sup>مَاتُوا</sup> And, when We have mercy on them after a hardship, they suddenly fall to the occurrence of plotting proceeding from them (K); but the context shows that this is intended as an explanation of the sense of haste in the 2nd إِذَا, not of its op.

P. 764, l. 1. In XXX. 24. the 1st إِذَا is *cond.* (K); and the 2nd denotes *suddenness of occurrence*, and [therefore (B)] supplies the place of the ف in the *correl.* (K, B) of the 1st (B), [i.e.] of the condition (K) — l. 15. By Ka'b Ibn Zuhair (S). <sup>أَإِذَا</sup> is *abstractive* [1] (N). Translate *I rouse in her (the she-camel), at the end of the night, a terrified wild bull*, MDL's rendering in the text being a paraphrase.

P. 765, l. 18. This verse is from an ode containing more than 10 verses by 'Abd Kais Ibn Khufāf, of the Barājim, [a people of the children of Hanzala Ibn Mālik (KF),] an Islāmi [poet]; but I have seen these verses attributed to Hāritha Ibn Badr alGhudāni atTamīmi (SM).

P. 766, l. 18. An Islāmi poet. AHm says he was of the Banū Kināna Ibn AlKain.....Ibn Kuḍā'a, and lived 200 years; and he is mentioned by IHjr in the Is among the converts, who reached the time of the Prophet, and become Muslims, but saw him not (AKB); and AUd says he was a heathen (Is).

P. 769, l. 7. After "the ج" insert "of inception". Z and B also hold the ج in this text to be the ج of inception, for the same reason as in LXXV. 1. (see the Note on Vol. II, p. 116, l. 2); and they meet the objection that the ج of inception, when prefixed to the *acr.*, gives the sense of the *present* with the reply that, when combined with

سَوْفَ, it is divested of the sense of the *present*, and denotes *were corroboration* [101], as the *art.* in يَا اللَّهُ [52] is divested of the sense of *determination*, and becomes a mere *compensation* for the Hamza of اللَّهُ: but IIIsh declares that this is an unnecessary elaboration; and asserts that the ج of the oath is sometimes necessary when the ق is disallowed, vid. when the *aor.* is conjoined with the *p.* of amplification, as in XIX. 67. (see the K and B on XIX. 67., and the ML on the ج).

P. 771, l. 10. The Banū Faḳ'as were a clan of the Banū Asad (T, AKB) Ibn Khuzaima. These verses are attributed also to 'Amr Ibn Asad alFaḳ'asī; and God knows! (AKB).

P. 772, l. 7. Abū Iailā is the surname of AlḤārith Ibn Zālim alMurrī, a heathen (AKB)—*ibid.* The sense is قَامَ لَيْتَ نَصْرَةَ (AKB).

P. 773, ll. 1, 5. The *gen.* after بَيْنَا in this verse, printed by Jahn (IY. 551) as the sole, and by Thorbecke (D. 64) as an alternative version, seems to be out of place here, because the discussion is about the propriety of introducing اُذْ and اِذْ into the *correl.* of بَيْنَا, which has a *correl.* only when it is *pre.*, as in the version with the *nom.*, to a *prop.* (see p. 778, ll. 8-10); not when it is *pre.*, as in the version with the *gen.*, to a single term—l. 10. It is related [by H. in the D (IKhn, HH) on the authority of IKlb (D)] that 'Abid [or 'Umair (AGh, Is, CD), which perhaps is due to a mistake (Is, CD) in hearing (Is),] Ibn [Shariya (Is, CD) or] Sharya alJurhumī, who lived [240 or, as is said (AGh, Is, CD),] 300 years, and reached AlIslām, and became a Muslim, entered the presence of Mu'āwiya [Ibn Abi Sufyān (IKhn, HH)] in Syria, when he was Khalifa. Then said Mu'āwiya to him "Tell me the most wonderful "of what thou hast seen." He said "I passed one day by some people "burying a dead man of theirs; and, when I had come up to them, "mine eyes filled with tears, and I quoted the saying of the poet." [Here follow 6 verses, of which the two in the text are the 4th and



5th.] "Then said a man to me 'Dost thou know who is the author  
 "of this poem?' I said 'No, [by God, except that I have been  
 "reciting it for a long time ! (III)]'. He said '[By Him thou swearst  
 "by (III),] verily the author of it is this [companion of ours (IH)]',  
 "whom we have buried at this hour !' " ... .. Then said Mu'awiya to  
 him "Verily thou hast seen a wonder : then who was the dead man ?"  
 He said "[He was (D, HII)] 'Ithyar Ibn Labid al-Udhri' (D, IKbu,  
 HH, II, 119). But to this there is the objection that [the corpse on the  
 bier and (SM)] the author of the verses was a man of [the Banu (CD)]  
 'Udhra called Huraith Ibn Jabala (SM, CD) ; and that [fact] is  
 positively asserted by Z in the Exposition of the Evidentiary Verses of S  
 (SM). 'Abd lived till the Khilāfa of 'Abd AlMalik Ibn Marwān (Is, CD).

P. 774, l. 7. I. e. the full phrase in <sup>9 9 9</sup>قَاتِلُوا قَاتِلِي (see p. 776, l. 3).

P. 776, l. 13. After "ps.," insert "[While etc, lo, he saw Hind,]"  
 —l. 21. alJurabi, of Juraib Ibn Sa'd Ibn Hudhail, a heathen poet  
 (AKB)—l. 23. <sup>9 9 9</sup>كُنْتَ إِذَا [as is said (Ml, AKB) by ISB (AKB),]  
 is a [well known (ZJ, MI, N) narrow (AKB)] mountain-road (ZJ, MI,  
 N, AKB) : but As says that every mountain-road is a <sup>9 9 9</sup>قَاتِلِي ; and, accord-  
 ing to his saying, its triptote declension [in the verse] is not due to  
 poetic license (AKB).

P. 779, l. 8. A minor Islāmī poet (KA), reckoned by MIS in the  
 2nd class of the Poets of AlIslām (AKB). He was a Christian (KA,  
 AKB), and then became a Muslim ; and he was the sister's son of  
 AlAkhtal (AKB). IAl says that the first thing mentioned of him is  
 that he arrived at Damascus in the Khilāfa of AlWalid Ibn 'Abd  
 AlMalik, or, as is said, of 'Umar Ibn 'Abd Al'Aziz (KA)—l. 14. Of the  
 Banu-Hārith Ibn Hammām [Ibn Murra Ibn Dhuhl Ibn Shaibān ash-  
 Shaibānī (T)], a Ṣaḥābī poet, mentioned by IHjr in the Is (AKB).

P. 781, ll. 15-16. See the whole poem at pp. 568-569 of the SR.

P. 784, l. 20. Its author is said by Jh to be Abu nNajm; and by some to be Ru'ba Ibn Al'Ajjāj, but it is not in his *Dīwān* (MN): and AZ says in his *Navādir* that MD said "Abu-lGhāl recited it to me as by one of the people of AlYaman" (MN, AKB); but Akh says in the Exposition of the *Navādir* that AHm said "I asked AU about these "verses, and he said, 'Put a mark upon them: this is a forgery of MD'" (AKB).

P. 785, l. 9. For "red." read "*red.*"—l. 14. The reference is to p. 568, l. 15.

P. 786, l. 19. K1 says that Rauḥ recited this poem in the presence of 'Abd AlMalik Ibn Marwān (MN). Rauḥ is mentioned by some among the Companions: but Companionship is not correctly attributable to him; though he may have been born in the time of the Prophet, for his father was a Companion. He is mentioned in the 2nd class of the Followers of the people of Syria; and is said to have been a Governor over Palestine. He died in 84 (Is).

P. 787, l. 11. For "bears" read "hears"—l. 20. Read "the Banū Tamīm".

P. 788, l. 19. From a *Rajaz* in the *Navādir* of AZ, who heard it from the Arabs (AKB).

P. 791, l. 5. The celebrated poet (MAd).

P. 794, l. 3. 'Iḥāḥ Ibn Murayy [alKushairī, who had taken up his abode in the neighbourhood of Bāhila (AKB),] was seized in a famine by AlAḥḍab Ibn 'Amr alBāhili, who roasted and ate him (KF, AKB).

مَرَى with Damm of the م, Faḥ of the , and reduplication of the م (AKB): مَرَى (KF)—l. 4. مَرَى is fem. of مَرَى, and means *Long-necked*.

Sgh says, مَرَى is *Calamity*, as مَرَى طَارَتْ بِهْ *Calamity flew away with him*, being orig. a *Great Bird* known in name, unknown in body. AHm says in the Book of Birds, As for مَرَى المَغْرِبِيَّة, it is *Calamity*, not one

of the birds that we know. And ID says, عَنقَاءٌ مَغْرِبٌ is a phrase that has no foundation [in fact]. it is said to be [the name of] a *Great Bird* seen only [once] in ages; but was so frequently used that they named *Calamity* عَنقَاءٌ مَغْرِبٌ, as

لَوْلَا سُلَيْمَانُ الْخَلِيفَةُ حَلَقَتْ \* يَدٌ مِنَ يَدِ الْحِجَابِ عَنقَاءٌ مَغْرِبٌ

And, but for Sulaimān the *Khalīfa*, a calamity from the hand of Al-Hajjāj would have soared away with him. And مَغْرِبٌ is an *act. part.* from أَغْرَبَ الرَّجُلُ فِي الْأَمْالِ when he goes far in them by incessant journeying; and is *ep.* of عَنقَاءٌ, meaning *far-flying*: Sgh says that the ة of feminization is elided in the same way as in نَاقَةٌ ضَامِرٌ A lank-bellied she-camel, i.e. ذَاتُ ضَمَرٍ possessed of lankness in the belly [312]; and so Z explains the masculinization of the *ep.*: but مَغْرِبَةٌ also is said (AKB).

P. 795, ll. 1-2. IS is followed by his pupil F, who is followed by his pupil IJ and by [another pupil] Abd (BS)—l. 22. For “v,” read “v.”

P. 798, l. 18. By [‘Abd Allāh] Ibn Hammām asSalūlī (S).

P. 800, l. 22. Abū Abd ArRaḥmān ‘Abd Allāh Ibn Ḥabīb asSulamī (IKb, IATH, IHjr, TH, TKh) alKaḥfī (IKb, IHjr, TH), the Reader (IKb, IHjr, TH, TKh) of Al-‘Irāq (TKh), one of the companions of ‘Alī (IKb), studied under ‘Uthmān and Ibn Mas‘ūd (TKh), taught Reading 40 years (TH, TKh), d. after 70 (IHjr, TH), in 74 (TKh), in 92 (TH), or in 105 at the age of 90 (IATH, TH).

P. 801, l. 19. The reference is to pp. 85, l. 21—86, l. 12.

P. 802, ll. 14-15. If the *n.* were not complete, the verbal *prop.* would be its *ep.* [44]; and, if this *prop.* did not contain the *pron.* of the *cond. n.*, it could be neither *enunc.* [27], nor *ep.* [144], of the latter.

P. 803, l. 15. The reference is to vol. II, p. 679, ll. 13-17.

P. 805, ll. 5-14. According to S, كَيْفَ is an *adv.*; but, according to Akh and Sf, it is a non-adverbial *n.* (ML).

P. 810, l. 6.

لَا جَعْلَنِي لَا بِنَّةً عَثْمُ فَنَّا \* مِنْ أَيْنَ عَشْرُونَ لَهَا مِنْ أَيْنِ

*I will assuredly make for the daughter of 'Uthmān a sort (of altercation), or a wonderful matter. From where has she twenty (camels), from where?* This verse is from a poem in the *Rajaz* metre transmitted from Th by Akh in the Exposition of the *Dīwān* of AZ. Akh says, Mb and Th say that by عَثْمُ he means عُثْمَانُ; but elides the ا and ن by poetic license, and pronounces its initial with Fath to indicate what is elided; and Th says that by فَنَّا he means *a sort (of altercation)*. ISk says that these verses were a satire on a Collector of the poor-rate. And Sf says, The *Rajaz* is by Mudrik Ibn Ḥuṣain; فَنَّا means *a wonderful matter*; and عَشْرُونَ means *twenty (camels)* (AKB).

P. 815, l. 10. And (ع) أَزْمَانُ أَزْمَانُ times (and) times, says IJ (AKB. III. 346), as in the hemistich cited in the Note on p. 757, l. 12—l. 18. Ibn Ḥujr alKindī (Jsh). The poets named Imra alḲais are many, among them Imra alḲais Ibn Ḥujr alKindī, Imra alḲais Ibn 'Ānis alKindī, and Imra alḲais Ibn Mālik anNumairī (Mr).

P. 816, l. 13. By Dābi Ibn AlḤarith [at Tamīmī (AKB)] alBurjūmī (Lane, p. 1380, col. 3), of the Banū Ghālib Ibn Ḥanzāla, who reached the Prophet, and died in prison in the time of 'Uthmān. AlBurjūmī is a *rel. n.* to the Barājim, who are 6 clans of the children of Ḥanzāla Ibn Mālik Ibn Zaid Manāt Ibn Tamīm, vid. Ḳais, 'Amr, Ghālib, Kulfa, Zulaiṃ, [sons of Ḥanzāla (IKb, ID),] and Mukāshir, who received the cognomen of AlBarājim because a man of them named Ḥāritha Ibn 'Āmir said to them "Come; then let us combine like the بُرَاجِمُ *finger*;

*joints*, [the *sing.* of which is <sup>فُجْرَة</sup> (ID),] of this my hand ;” whereupon they did so, and were then named <sup>أَلْبُرُجُمُ</sup>, which are *the joints of the fingers*, 3 in each finger (AKB).

P. 817, l. 1. By AlFarazdaq (AKB).

P. 818, l. 7. Al‘Amrī, one of the Banū ‘Amr Ibn AlḤārith Ibn Tamīm Ibn Sa‘d Ibn Hudhail, an Islāmī poet; a convert, according to what is mentioned in the Is on the authority of AlMarzubānī ; but, according to the KA, a poet of the Umawī dynasty, one of their eulogists, who composed odes on ‘Abd AlMalik Ibn Marwān and ‘Abd Al‘Azīz Ibn Marwān, with the latter of whom he abode long in Egypt (AKB).

P. 819, ll. 4-5, 13, 21. See HH. I. 326.

P. 822, ll. 13-15. I.e. S makes it *uninfl.* in both members, but Z only in the 1st member.

P. 823, l. 16. See the Note on p. 14, l. 1—ll. 17-18. Saif adDaula Abu-lḤasan ‘Alī Ibn ‘Abd Allāh Ibn Ḥamdān atTaghlabī, who became chief of Aleppo in 333, [and before that was chief of Wāsiṭ and those regions (ITB),] b. 301 or 303, d. 356 (IKhn, ITB). His sister Khaula died in 352 (ITB).

P. 826, l. 1. Of the *Madīd* [metre] (MN). <sup>نَعِيمٌ</sup> is *post* to <sup>سَوْدَةٌ</sup> (DM): but <sup>نَعِيمٌ</sup> would violate the metre ; and I think that <sup>نَعِيمٌ سَوْدَةٌ</sup> is like <sup>أَعَانَتْ أَطْيَرُ</sup> (see pp. 363, 463, 489), meaning *and how many prosperous men, subjects* (see the next Note).

P. 829, l. 1. This verse, where the *sp.* of <sup>كَم</sup> occurs *pl.* and *sing.*, combines both constructions (DM) ; and, but for the pluralization of the *pron.* in the *enunc.* <sup>بَادُوا</sup> [222], I should have translated the 2nd hemistich *and how many a prosperous subject* (literally *a prosperous man, a subject*) *has perished* !

P. 830, l. 22. After "riding-beast" insert an Italicized note of admiration—l. 24. The *sp.* of <sup>كَم</sup> is <sup>مَحْدُودِيَا</sup> (AAz, MN); and the phrase is constructively <sup>وَكَمْ مَحْدُودِيَا غَارَهَا مِنْ الْأَرْضِ نُونَهُ</sup> (AAz): or rather, as I suppose, the *sp.* is <sup>بَقَعَةً</sup> or the like suppressed, qualified by <sup>مَحْدُودِيَا غَارَهَا</sup>, the full phrase being <sup>وَكَمْ نُونَهُ بِقَعَةٍ مِنْ الْأَرْضِ مَحْدُودِيَا غَارَهَا</sup>, otherwise it is difficult to account for the gender of the *pron.* attached to <sup>غَارُ</sup>, which is the *ag.* of <sup>مَحْدُودِيَا</sup>.

P. 831, l. 7. Its author is said to be Dhu-rRumma; but I have not found it in his *Dīwān* (MN)—l. 12. The verse occurs anonymously in the S and M; and not one of their Commentators [except IY] has attributed it to its author: but [IY followed by] Al'Aini says it is by AlFarazdaq; and God knows! (AKB)—l. 15. This is one of some verses attributed by the author of the KA to Anas Ibn Zunaim alKinānī, a Ṣaḥābī poet, who said them to 'Uḡbaid Allāh Ibn Ziyād Ibn Sumayya, Governor of Al'Irāq, [k. 67 (1Kb, IAtH)]: so say the author of the KA, the Expositors of the verses of S, and the Commentators of the *Jumal*. And the 1st verse [with a different version] is cited by R in the Commentary on the SH to show that <sup>دَعَّ</sup> *pret.* of <sup>يَدَعُّ</sup> has been heard [482]. The verses have also been attributed to 'Abd Allāh Ibn Kuraiz, and to AbulAswad adDu'alī; and God knows! (AKB)—ll. 23-25. This means that, when the *sp.* of the *interrog.* <sup>كَمْ</sup> would, if <sup>كَمْ</sup> were not separated from it, be governed in the *gen.* [224], it is treated, when <sup>كَمْ</sup> is separated from it, in the same way as the *sp.* of the separated enunciatory <sup>كَمْ</sup>.

P. 834, l. 7. Read "Banū".

P. 840, l. 7. 'Umar, or Muḥammad, [or 'Abd Allāh (Dh),] Ibn 'Abd ArRaḥmān Ibn Muḥaiṣin [asSaḥmī (IHjr)], the Reader [of the people (IHjr)] of Makka (Dh, IHjr), who studied reading under

Mujāhid (Ih), d. 123 (IHjr)—l. 16. The IY (p. 587, l. 14) has كَيْتٌ and ذَيْتٌ without repetition.

P. 841, ll. 9-12. IBr says, This distinction is the opinion of Th and his followers ; while Khl and S and their followers make no distinction between them : and H sometimes forgets what he says here, for he says in his *Maḳāmāt* وَأَمَّا أَصْحَابُهُمْ خَبَرُ ذَيْتٍ فَقَهَقُوا مِنْ كَيْتٍ وَكَيْتٍ وَأَمَّا أَلْعَجُ . Then they burst out laughing at such and such a story, and only the announcement of such and such an affair made them laugh (CD). See H. 235, where, however, I do not find وَأَمَّا أَلْعَجُ . Thorbecke (D. 99) omits the , throughout, printing كَيْتٌ كَيْتٌ and ذَيْتٌ ذَيْتٌ ; but the Constantinople ed. (p. 60) and the CD (p. 143) give it.

P. 842, ll. 20-21. As

كَانَ بَيْنَ فُكَيْهَا وَالْفَكِ \* فَارَةً مَسِكٍ ذُبِحَتْ فِي سَكِّ

(IY, R), by Manẓūr Ibn Marthad alAsadī, praising a woman for fragrance of the mouth, *As though between her jaw and the jaw were a bag of musk slit open in perfume* of the kind called سَكٌّ (AKB), meaning بَيْنَ فُكَيْهَا between her two jaws (IY, AKB). Manẓūr Ibn Marthad, also called Ibn Ḥabba, Ḥabba being his mother, was a Rājiz of the Banū Asad Ibn Khuzaima (AKB). سَكِّ (IY) : سَكِّ with Ḍamm of the س (AKB). In vol. II, p. 690, l. 1, read “Ḥabba”.

P. 843, l. 4. الدَّامِ is a dial. var. of الذِّمِّ (AKB)—l. 5. A heathen poet. Zimmān [Ibn Mālik Ibn Ṣaʿb Ibn ʿAlī Ibn Bakr Ibn Waʿil in Rabīʿa (IHb)] was one of the poet’s ancestors, and was of the Banū Ḥanīfa (AKB) ; [or more correctly] the Banū Zimmān were of Mālik Ibn Ṣaʿb, but were reckoned among [their cousins] the Banū Ḥanīfa Ibn Lujaīm Ibn Ṣaʿb (IKb).

P. 845, l. 17. By AlKumait Ibn Ṭhaḥlaba (Md, AKB) alAsadī, a Faḳ'asī Asadī Islāmī poet, called AlKumait alAkbar, grand-father of AlKumait Ibn Ma'rūf Ibn AlKumait alAkbar. He became a Muslim in the time of the Prophet, but did not join him; and is mentioned by IHjr in the Is among the Converts on the authority of AU and AlMarzubānī (AKB). He has elided the ة from فُؤَارَةٌ as it is elided in curtailment, although this is in the *non-voc.* [58]; or he may have meant مِنْ فُؤَارِيٍّ, and then lightened the ي of relation (Md)—l. 18. The Banū Fazāra are taunted with eating the penis of the he-ass (AKB). The story is that 3 men joined company together, a Fazārī, a Taghlabī, and a Kilābī. They found a [wild (AKB)] he-ass; and, when the Fazārī had gone away on one of his needs, they cooked and ate, but kept the yard of the he-ass for the Fazārī. On his return, they said to him "We have kept for thee [thy share (AKB)]: then eat". So he set about eating [it (Md)], but was [almost (Md)] unable to swallow it. Then [said he "Was all the roast-meat of the he-ass a penis?"; and (Md)] they began to laugh. Then he perceived [the trick played upon him]; and took the sword, [and went up to them (AKB),] and said "Ye "shall assuredly eat [of (AKB)] it, or I will [surely (Md)] slay you" (Md, AKB). Then they refused; so he smote one of them, and killed him; and the other took it, and ate of it (AKB). For Md's ending of the story see the Note on p. 588, ll. 18-19—l. 19.—The 1st *Fazāra* is the tribe of Fazāra, and the 2nd is their eponymous ancestor.

P. 846, l. 2. Khiṭām, or Bishr, Ibn Naṣr, of the Banu-lAbyaḍ Ibn Mujaṣhi' Ibn Dārim, the Rājiz (AKB).

P. 849, l. 9. مَلِيَّان (M) : مَلِيَّان and مَلِيَّ (IY) : مَلِيَّان and مَلِيَّ (Mb. 59)—l. 21. See Md. I. 151 and P. I. 301.

P. 850, l. 20. عِلَّا (A).

P. 851, l. 7. مَسْمُوع Devotee (IA) : قَرَأَ Excellent reader (R).



P. 852, l. 19. عَاشُورَءَانِ (A), apparently a misprint.

P. 853, l. 1. This verse is the last of an ode composed by AlFarazdaq at the end of his life, when repenting towards God of his excesses in his satirizing people; and in it he blames Iblīs for having misled him in his youth (AKB).

P. 854, l. 1. The *du. pron.* relates to Iblīs and his son (AKB)—l. 3. By “the barker” he means *the poet that applies himself to satire and abuse*; and like it is “the howler” (AKB)—ll. 4-5. ذُو being *orig.* ذُوِي, its *du.* ought to be ذُوِيَا, but is ذُوَا; so that its ِ is not restored: while the *du.* of ذَاتُ, *orig.* ذَاتُ, like نَوَاتُ, is ذَوَاتَا; so that the ِ, i.e. the ِ substituted for the ى, is restored. R in another place (*vol.* I, p. 266) says “The ِ of ذُو is a ى, as is proved by ذَوَاتَا and ذَرَاتُ, “because the *cat.* of طَوِيْتُ is more numerous than that of الْقَوَّةُ, and to “make it accord with the most prevalent is better”; and “the ع is “elided in ذَاتُ from frequency of usage”—l. 20. Abū Bilāl Mirdās Ibn ‘Amr Ibn Ḥudair [alḤanzalī (IATH)], of [the Banū (ID)] Rabī‘a Ibn Ḥanzala [Ibn Mālik Ibn Zaid Manāt Ibn Tamīm (Mb)], was known, like his brother ‘Urwa, as Ibn Udayya, she being a [heathen (Mb)] grandmother of theirs (IKb, ID). He revolted against ‘Ubaid Allāh Ibn Ziyād (ID), and was killed in 61 (IATH). ‘Urwa was killed by ‘Ubaid Allāh Ibn Ziyād (IKb, IATH) in 58 (IATH). For “Udayya” [in *vol.* II, p. 142, l. 15] one MS [of the D] has “Udhaina,” which is correct (OD). ‘Urwa Ḥbn Udhaina alLaithī, [of the Banū Laith, a Kinānī (T)], alḤijāzī, the celebrated poet, *d.* about 130 (FW)—l. 21. ID, who is the authority in this matter, attributes the verse to ‘Alī Ibn Baddāl Ibn Sulaim; and God knows! (AKB).

P. 855, l. 12. Attributed by Sgh to Shu‘ba Ibn [‘Umair (Is) or] Kūmair [aṭṬuhawī, a heathen (Is), or] a converted poet, who [reached AlIslām (Is), and] believed in the time of Prophet, but did not see him

mentioned by IHjr in the Is among the Converts (AKB). One of the 2 ف is *red*, as in لَئِنْ جُئِيَ الْفُجْ [62, 540] (AAz)—l. 20. alKalbī, an Islāmī poet (AKB).

P. 856, l. 17. By AlFarazdaq, satirizing Jarīr, whom he ridicules, and makes out to be a woman. He likens each half of the <sup>أُفٍّ</sup> [mentioned 2 verses before, and] here meaning *vulva*, to the *face of a Turk*, the Turks being coarse, broad, and red in the face (AKB)—l. l. The Mother of the Believers (Is), Ḥafṣa Bint ‘Umar Ibn AlKhattāb, is said to have been born [when Quraysh were building the House (Nw),] 5 years before the Mission [of the Prophet (Nw)]; was married by the Apostle of God [after ‘Ā’isha (Is)] in the year 2 or 3, [the latter date being preferable (Is)]; and died in the year 27, [28 (Nw),] 41, 45, (Nw, Is), 47, or 50, at the age of 60 (Nw). Between the *Hijra* and the birth of the Apostle of God were 53 years 2 months and 8 days; between the *Hijra* and the Mission of the Apostle of God were 13 years 2 months and 8 days; and between the *Hijra* and the death of the Apostle of God were 9 years 11 months and 22 days (AF). The *Hijra* is the beginning of the Islāmī era (Nw, AF); and the first [person] that dated by the *Hijra* was ‘Umar Ibn AlKhattāb in the year 17 of the *Hijra* (Nw). The *Hijra* occurred (AF, TKh) in the 14th year of the Mission (TKh), when AlMuḥarram, Ṣafar, and 8 days of Rabi‘ alAwwal had elapsed. So, when they resolved upon founding [the era of] the *Hijra*, they went back 68 days, and made the beginning of the era the 1st of AlMuḥarram of this year. Then they computed from the 1st of AlMuḥarram to the last day of the Prophet’s life, and it was 10 years and 2 months; whereas, when his age is really reckoned from the *Hijra*, he is found to have lived 9 years 11 months and 22 days after it, [the difference between the 2 periods being 2 months and 8 days, i.e. 68 days] (AF). [But the assertion that the period from the 1st of AlMuḥarram in the year of the *Hijra* to the last day of the Prophet’s life was 10 years and 2 months is difficult to reconcile with the state-

ment that] he died (God bless him, and give him peace !) in the forenoon, [or, as is said, at midday (AF),] on Monday, when 12 nights were left, [i.e. on the 18th,] of Rabi' alAwwal in the year 11 [of the *Hijra* (Nw), i.e. 10 years 2 months and 18 days from, and including, the 1st of AlMuḥarram in the year of the *Hijra*]. He died at the age of 63, the [most correct and (Nw)] best-known [opinion]; or, as is said, 65 or 60 (Nw, AF). The preferable opinion is that he was sent [on his Apostolic Mission] at 40 years, and abode in Makka calling [the unbelievers] to AlIslām 13 years and a fraction, and abode at AlMadīna after the *Hijra* nearly 10 years; and that is 63 years and some fractions (AF). If, then, Ḥaṣṣa was born 5 years before the Mission, she was 18 or a little more at the beginning of the *Hijrī* era; so that, if she lived 60 years, she died in 41.

P. 857, ll. 25-26. The truth is that these 2 verses are from a *Rajaz* by Khitām alMujāshī'i, an Islāmī poet; not by Ḥumyān Ibn Kuḥāfa (AKB) the Rājiz (ID).

P. 859, l. 8. Abū 'Aṭā was a contemporary of the 2 dynasties: he praised the Banū Umayya and the Banū Hāshim (KA). Yazīd Ibn 'Umar Ibn Hubaira [alFazārī (ITB), b. 87 (IKhn)], governor of the 2 'Irāqs for Marwān Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Marwān Ibn AlḤakam [alQurashī (TKh) alUmaywī (IKhn, TKh) adDimashkī (TKh), known as alJa'dī, and nicknamed AlḤimār (IKhn), the last Khalifa of the Banū Umayya (IKhn, TKh), b. 72 (TKh) or 76 (Tr, IATH, ITB)], a. 127, l. 132 at the age of [58 (MDh),] 59, [62 (IATH, MAB), 69 (MDh, IATH), or 70 (MDh)], was put to death by Abū Ja'far alManṣūr, [afterwards Khalifa,] at Wāsiṭ in 132 in violation of a capitulation (IKb). The advice of Abū Ja'far was to keep faith with him; but Abū Ja'far's brother Abu-l'Abbās 'Abd Allāh asSaffāḥ Ibn Muḥammad [alQurashī (TKh) alHāshimī (ITB) al'Abbāsī (ITB, TKh), the 1st Khalifa of the Banu-l'Abbās (FW, ITB), b. 108 (FW, TKh)], a. 132, d. [135 or (TKh)] 136 [at the age of 27 (TKh), 28 (Tr, IATH, FW, TKh), 29 (MDh), 32 (TKh), 33 (Tr, MDh, IATH, MAB, ITB, TKh), or 36 (Tr, IATH)], insisted upon Abū

Ja'far's putting him to death (IKhn). Marwān was called AlJa'dī [because he had learnt (Iath, MAB)] from [his preceptor and master (TKh)] AlJa'd Ibn Dirham (Iath, MAB, TKh) the doctrines of the Creation of the Qur'ān and of Predestination (Iath, MAB), etc. (Iath) : and he was known as AlHīmār because of his bravery, from the saying *فَلَانٌ أَصْبَرُ مِنْ جِمَارٍ فِي الْحَرْبِ* *Such a one is more patient than a he-ass in war* ; for he used not to flag in waging war upon the rebels against him, and was the bravest of the Banū Umayya (TKh). It is said that AlJa'd Ibn Dirham published his doctrine of the Creation of the Qur'ān in the days of Hishām Ibn 'Abd AlMalik, under whose order he was put to death by Khālīd alKasrī, governor of Al'Irāk (Iath). The Wāsiṭ of Al'Irāk was founded by AlHajjāj Ibn Yūsuf athThaḡafī between AlKūfa and AlBaṣra ; and for that reason was named Wāsiṭ, because it was intermediate between the 2 cities, [the distance from it to each being 50 parasangs (MI), i.e. leagues] : it was begun by him in 84, and finished in 86 (Mk)—l. 12. The 1st hemistich is

حَشَايَ عَلَى جِمْرِ ذِكِّي مِنَ الْغَضَا

*My heart is on glowing embers of the wood called غَضَا ; and the verse is from an ode by AlMutanabbi : W says (AKB), He says My heart is on glowing embers from passion, i.e. on account of their bidding farewell and their departing ; and mine eye is revelling in the face of the beloved in a garden of beauty (W, AKB). مِنْ الْغَضَا (W) for مِنْ الْهُوَى .*

P. 860, ll. 2-3. *بُطْنُ عَاكِلٍ* *The bottom, or low land, of 'Ākīl is [a place (MI)] on the road of the pilgrims of AlBaṣra between Rāmātān and (Mk, MI) Āmirra (Mk) [or] Immara (MI)—l. 4. 'Ākīl is said to be a mountain (Bk, ZJ) that Ḥujr, the father of Imra alKais, used to dwell in (Bk). The author of the Mk, after enumerating 8 places named 'Ākīl, the 2nd of which he describes as "a mountain that the "children of [Ḥujr (KA)] 'Ākīl alMurār, the ancestor of Imra alKais, "used to stop in", adds "But I do not find myself confident that they*

“are 8 [separate] places ; and perhaps there is some intermixture in them”—l. 8. See Md. II. 182 and P. II. 598—ll. 16-17. The R (*vol.* II, p. 142, ll.) has “either because repetition of the *v*. is made a “substitute for dualization of the *ag.*”, which, though it occurs in all 3 *eds.*, I have ventured to invert—ll. 19-20. The 2 Indian *eds.* of the R<sub>2</sub> (*vol.* ii, p. 143, l. 2) have صاحب *his companion* ; but the Persian *ed.* has صاحبه *his 2 companions*.

P. 861, l. 1. تسمية جزء باسم كل *namng a part by the name of a whole* (R), i.e., putting a whole for a part, as *penes* for *penis* and *testicles* for *two testicles* in the *exs.* given—l. 3. Read “two testicles” and “substitutions.”

